

NORTHWEST
WORKPLACE
LAW^{PLLC}



INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS

Investigation of Dr. Matt Manweller

Trish K. Murphy
July 6, 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. INVESTIGATION PROCESS	1
III. BACKGROUND	4
A. Overview	4
B. Prior Issues and Inquiries	4
C. Current Investigation	5
IV. SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS AND EVIDENCE	5
A. Interviewee A	6
B. Interviewee B	13
C. Interviewee C	16
D. Interviewee D	17
E. Interviewee E	21
F. Interviewee F	24
G. Interviewee G	25
H. Interviewee H	29
I. Interviewee I	32
J. Interviewee K	35
K. Interviewee L	36
L. Interviewee M	43
M. Interviewee N	45
N. Interviewee O	47
O. Interviewee P	48
P. Other Witness Information	50
V. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	52
A. Credibility Assessments	52
B. Summary of Findings	56
C. Findings on Specific Allegations	58
1. Finding: Interviewee A	58
2. Finding: Interviewee B	62
3. Finding: Interviewee C	64

4. Finding: Interviewee D	64
5. Finding: Interviewee E	67
6. Finding: Interviewee F	69
7. Finding: Interviewee G	70
8. Finding: Interviewee H	72
9. Finding: Interviewee I	74
10. Finding: Interviewee K	76
11. Finding: Interviewee L	76
12. Finding: Interviewee M	80
13. Finding: Interviewee N	80
14. Finding: Interviewee O	82
15. Finding: Interviewee P	83
16. Finding: Other Witness Information	83
VI. CONCLUSION.....	85

I. INTRODUCTION

Central Washington University retained Trish Murphy of Northwest Workplace Law PLLC to conduct an independent investigation in the role of neutral fact finder. The scope of the investigation included claims related to sexual harassment and unprofessional conduct by Dr. Matt Manweller involving current or former female University students.

In December 2017, multiple media outlets reported on various allegations against Manweller, including University investigations conducted in 2012 and 2013 and anonymous concerns raised by lobbyists, a former legislative intern, and a former legislative assistant. The University subsequently received a number of concerned communications from students, parents, alumni, and members of the public. These communications included several complaints about Manweller not previously investigated by the University.

This investigation report details concerns raised about Manweller's conduct by fifteen current and former female University students as well as supporting information provided by numerous witnesses. A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that Manweller engaged in a pattern of unprofessional and inappropriate behavior with gender-based and sexual overtones with female students and former students from 2004 to 2017. This conduct included, but was not limited to:

- Looking at the bodies of female students and former students
- Offering an educational benefit in exchange for sex
- Communications with sexual or romantic overtones
- Physical touching
- Compliments based on physical characteristics
- Asking inappropriate personal questions
- Actions that made third party observers uncomfortable
- Other inappropriate attention

II. INVESTIGATION PROCESS

In this report, female students and former students who shared personal concerns about Manweller's conduct are identified as follows.

- Interviewee A (I.A.)
- Interviewee B (I.B.)
- Interviewee C (I.C.)
- Interviewee D (I.D.)
- Interviewee E (I.E.)
- Interviewee F (I.F.)
- Interviewee G (I.G.)
- Interviewee H (I.H.)
- Interviewee I (I.I.)

- Interviewee J (n/a)¹
- Interviewee K (I.K.)
- Interviewee L (I.L.)
- Interviewee M (I.M.)
- Interviewee N (I.N.)
- Interviewee O (I.O.)
- Interviewee P (I.P.)

Individuals interviewed also included people with information relevant to the concerns raised by Interviewees I.A. – I.P. They are referred to using identifiers ranging from Witness 1 (W.1.) to Witness 26 (W.26.).

Information relevant to the allegations was gathered through interviews (in person and via telephone) and email correspondence. The interviews were not audio recorded. Some individuals were interviewed multiple times, as needed. Those who were interviewed were reminded that allegations are just allegations until proven otherwise.

Additional interviews were conducted with 48 other individuals during the course of the investigation. Because they did not offer information directly relevant to the claims of I.A. – I.P., those individuals are not listed in this report.² A number of the people with whom this investigator attempted to make contact did not respond or did not make themselves available for an interview.

A week prior to Manweller’s investigatory interview, this investigator provided him with approximately 25 typed pages of information detailing the substance of the claims of I.A. – I.O.³ and information from 21 witnesses.⁴

¹Interviewee J contacted the University in December 2017 after reading an article about Manweller in the Seattle Times. In her interviews for this investigation, she described concerns about her experiences with Manweller while she was a student at the University. On May 24, 2018, Interviewee J indicated that due to fears relating to being identified, she was requesting confidentiality. For that reason, her information is not included. References to “I.A. – I.P.” in this report should be understood to exclude Interviewee J.

² Some of these individuals raised concerns based on information that was not first-hand. Some thought they knew someone who had a concern about Manweller or a person who traded sex for grades with Manweller. Many of the people interviewed described hearing rumors about Manweller’s conduct with female students. Where there was an absence of first-hand information or evidence with some relevance to the experiences of I.A. – I.P., what was shared by these individuals was not determined to be of probative value for fact finding on the claims of I.A. – I.P.

³ At the time of Manweller’s interview, I.P. had not yet been identified or contacted.

⁴ Section 24.6 of the faculty union’s collective bargaining agreement requires: “Before any investigatory interview, a faculty member will be informed of the nature of the matter or allegations in sufficient detail to reasonably apprise him/her of the matter, unless such notice would endanger the investigation.” The amount of information provided to Manweller a week prior to his interview exceeded the requirements of the collective bargaining agreement. He was provided with individuals’ identities to the extent needed to respond to the allegations and supporting information.

On June 5, 2018, Manweller attended his investigatory interview with his union representative, his faculty union president, and his attorney.⁵ Manweller was offered, but did not accept, an option to be audio recorded and receive a copy of the recording. His interview lasted a total of approximately four hours.

Additional information and documents were shared with Manweller during the interview. He was given an opportunity to suggest individuals to be interviewed and questions to be asked of them. Manweller also had the opportunity to offer other information to be considered in the investigation.

Following Manweller's interview, seven additional interviews were conducted for the investigation, including interviews with four individuals requested by Manweller. Similar to the process prior to his interview, Manweller received detailed information about these interviews as well as copies of documentation gathered.⁶

Documentary evidence reviewed for the investigation included: documentation of concerns about Manweller submitted to the University in December 2017; letter from Dean T. Englund to Manweller dated December 8, 2017; current and past collective bargaining agreements between the University and the United Faculty of Central; University policies, including but not limited to the sexual harassment policy and conflict of interest policy; Human Resources investigation desk procedures; University procedures potentially relevant to the issues of this investigation; the University Faculty Senate's Faculty Code; email messages; text messages; December 2017 media coverage discussing anonymous sources who raised concerns about Manweller, beginning with a December 6, 2017 Seattle Times article; Washington Legislature staff rosters; 2017 House committee video; session dates of the Washington Legislature; a LinkedIn request to Manweller from an interviewee; letters and memos related to Manweller's job performance; records of courses taught by Manweller; Political Science graduation records; a program for the 2009 SOURCE Symposium; reports of 2012 and 2013 investigations of Manweller and related documents; report by N. Ack, dated December 3, 2013; settlement and release agreement between the University and Manweller, executed October 29, 2014; grievance settlement between the University and the United Faculty of Central, executed December 10, 2013; letter from Dean K. Johnson to Manweller dated July 15, 2013; memo from Dean K. Johnson to Manweller dated October 7, 2013; 2013 document titled "Dr. Manweller's Response to CWU's Improper Efforts to Undermine His Professional Career," with attachments; "Written Reprimand for Un-Professional Conduct & Appearance of Abuse of Power" issued to Manweller by Dean K. Johnson on April 3, 2013; letter from S. Sleigh-Layman to Manweller dated May 22, 2018; sketch of Manweller's office interior, drawn by Manweller on June 5, 2018; diagram of Manweller's office interior, drawn by I.G. on June 12, 2018; a lease for a rental home in Olympia for the 2016 legislative session; and photos of the interior of Manweller's office as it appeared in early June 2018.

⁵ As of the date of this report, Manweller's attorney was not known to be representing the faculty union, the United Faculty of Central.

⁶ These included interviews with I.P., W.22., W.23., W.24., W.25., W.26., and another employee whose information was not directly relevant to the claims of I.A. – I.P. Additional information was gathered from I.D., I.G., and I.L. and shared with Manweller.

When needed, University staff conducted records searches for various information, such as courses that were taken by particular students and corresponding dates.

III. BACKGROUND

A. Overview

Dr. Matt Manweller is a tenured professor in the University's Political Science Department. He joined the University as a professor in 2003. Manweller's position is represented by the United Faculty of Central and covered by the collective bargaining agreement between the University and the United Faculty of Central.

Manweller generally has received strong ratings on his student evaluations and is held in regard by many for his strengths in teaching. On April 30, 2018, Katherine P. Frank, CWU Provost/Vice President for Academic and Student Life, notified Manweller that after reviewing his professional record she was pleased to recommend that he be continued in his tenured position at the University.

Manweller has served as State Representative for the 13th Legislative District since 2012. Some of the activities the University compensates Manweller for are related to his service in the Legislature. Such activities include recruiting students for the Olympia Program, teaching a seminar with the Legislative Intern Program, and supervising interns with Government Relations and Associated Students of CWU Legislative Affairs.

In early December 2017, local newspapers reported that four lobbyists, a former legislative intern, and a former legislative assistant, all females, had raised concerns about interactions with Manweller. According to a Seattle Times article on December 14, 2017, House Republican Leader Dan Kristiansen said in a statement that he called for Manweller to step down from his position as Republican Assistant Floor Leader and that Manweller agreed. The article indicated that Kristiansen's statement also announced that Manweller had been removed as Ranking Republican Member of the House's Labor and Workplace Standards Committee.⁷

B. Prior Issues and Inquiries

In June 2007, the then Chair of the Political Science Department, and another staff member, a former Counseling Psychologist, met with Manweller regarding interactions with female students.

In 2012, the University retained an independent investigator to investigate allegations that Manweller engaged in inappropriate conduct with a female student. Although the investigator concluded that "evidence exists to suggest" that Manweller's conduct violated the University's sexual harassment policy, the University declined to take disciplinary action at that time. The 2012 investigation and its relevance to the current investigation are addressed in Section IV.K below.

⁷ This investigation did not pursue with House leadership the reasons for these actions.

In addition to the allegations of the female student that were investigated, the 2012 investigation report listed instances of female students raising concerns about Manweller to various parties. These concerns included behavior such as trading grades for sexual favors and inappropriate advances and comments. The investigator stated that he had not been able to ascertain the identity of any other female students asserting similar allegations against Manweller.

A subsequent investigation that concluded in 2013 also found “evidence suggesting” that Manweller violated the University’s sexual harassment policy. Following that investigation, Kirk Johnson, then Dean of the College of the Sciences, issued Manweller a “Written Reprimand for Un-Professional Conduct & Appearance of Abuse of Power” on April 3, 2013.⁸ The reprimand stated that Manweller had admitted engaging in inappropriate behavior with a female student from one of his classes and another female student at a local bar. The document also referenced another incident involving a current female student. Johnson stated:

I find these incidents to be unprofessional and have the appearance of an abuse of power There is the appearance that you still do not understand boundaries and how to maintain those boundaries Failure to meet the expectations above and/or should any further incidents regarding inappropriate relations with students come forward, further discipline may occur up to and including dismissal.

C. Current Investigation

On December 8, 2018, Dean of the College of the Sciences Tim Englund gave Manweller written notification that effective immediately, he was being placed on administrative leave with pay pending investigation of allegations of sexual harassment and unprofessional conduct. Among other things, the letter advised him that, effective immediately, he was to have no contact with University students, current or past.⁹ Manweller remained on leave at the time of the submission of this investigation report.

IV. SUMMARY OF ALLEGATIONS AND EVIDENCE

This section summarizes the information gathered during the course of the investigation, including Manweller’s responses to allegations about his conduct. The analysis and findings are detailed in Section V.

⁸ In October 2014, Manweller and the University executed a “Settlement and Release Agreement” regarding “certain disputed issues as between the parties relating to reported student concerns.” It did not address the 2013 written reprimand, which remains in Manweller’s personnel file.

⁹ On May 22, 2018, Executive Director of Human Resources Staci Sleight-Layman issued a letter to Manweller that contained similar messaging about the focus of the investigation and not contacting current or former CWU students.

A. Interviewee A (I.A.)

I.A. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including but not limited to complimenting her appearance, asking personal questions, turning a meeting into a date, and looking at her body. She asserted the following:

- I.A. is a former CWU student who took a class from Manweller in 2009.
- During the 2017 legislative session, she worked for the nonpartisan office that staffs committees for the House of Representatives. The timeframe was December through April. She was assigned to a House committee. The committee met for hearings three times a week, and I.A. would see Manweller there.
- Manweller would seek her out to chat or say hi. He did this after committee meetings, and if she saw him on the Capitol Campus, he would stop and say hi to her. He did this even if he was talking with another legislator. She recalled him calling “Good morning, [I.A.]” from the elevator when she was working reception. I.A. found these interactions different than her experiences with other legislators; she expected to not be noticed by them.
- In the committee meetings, there were several occasions when I.A. looked up from taking notes to find Manweller looking right at her. I.A. did not experience this with other committee members.
- Manweller asked her for her resume multiple times and initiated talk with her about her career. He said he wanted her resume in case he heard of anything or if he could give it to someone. One morning, I.A. ran into him and he asked her for her resume a third time. She emailed him her resume from her personal email account. He responded and said to let him know if she wanted to meet and discuss what she wanted to do. She agreed to meet.
- Manweller emailed I.A. his phone number. When she called him, he immediately texted her saying he was in Appropriations and said: “you can pull me out.” I.A. thought he didn’t know who it was, so she texted him back to say “this is [I.A.]” They exchanged some texts about meeting. Later, he texted her another night from Appropriations late in the evening, saying how much he didn’t want to be there. I.A. kept her responses short.
- At one point, Manweller texted I.A. to come meet him so that he could introduce her to the Treasurer. He also introduced her to his chief of staff. I.A. thought it was like Manweller was trying to impress her.
- The meeting they had talked about having kept getting pushed off, until one day in early April when they agreed to meet at 5:30. They arranged to meet at the sundial on the Capitol Campus, and I.A. thought they would be meeting outside. Manweller started walking, at which point I.A. thought the meeting was going to be a walk. Then Manweller said: “This is my car” and “What’s your favorite place in Olympia?” I.A. still

wasn't quite following. She wasn't sure if he was talking about dinner or a drink, and she didn't know until they got to the place, which was a nice restaurant called Dillinger's.

- I.A. estimated that she and Manweller were at Dillinger's between an hour and a half and two hours. Manweller did not ask her if she needed to be somewhere. She was worried about getting home because of her two dogs. The length of the dinner made her anxious, and it was very awkward.
- Manweller ordered a drink for himself. He also ordered her a vodka tonic after she said she did not want a drink. Manweller was using a flirtatious tone and acting like someone on a date. He poked fun at her for not wanting to have a drink and for not being able to eat much of anything on the menu.
- While the purpose of the meeting was to discuss her career, Manweller largely talked about other things, and I.A. struggled to turn the talk to something productive.
- Manweller asked I.A. a variety of personal questions. Manweller wanted to know if I.A. lived alone and asked if she had been dating in Olympia. In regard to her prior marriage, Manweller asked: "Did you try to have kids and couldn't?" It was not a line of questioning that she would want to discuss with him, and she felt really uncomfortable.
- During the dinner, he gave her several compliments. I.A. specifically recalled him telling the server "It's up to this beautiful woman to decide" whether they would have dessert.
- When they were getting up to leave, Manweller grabbed I.A.'s jacket before she could, and he put it on her. Then he opened the restaurant door for her. He also opened the car door for her.
- Manweller texted I.A. that same night, saying: "Hey. Just checking to make sure you made it home safe. You did have a whole vodka tonic and all [smiley face emoji]." She called her sister and said: "I think I went on a date."
- Within the same week, I.A. shared what happened with Manweller with the head of her office, who encouraged her to tell her supervisors. Her supervisors were very upset and supportive of her.
- Subsequently, I.A. was nervous about seeing Manweller. He continued to text her. A few texts were related to her job search. Another said: "Have a good weekend and Happy Easter [emoji of a baby chick in an egg shell]."
- A couple of days before she finished her work at the Legislature, Manweller texted I.A.: "Hey there [smiley face emoji]. Do you want to grab dinner tonight??" The message did not mention another person or a business-related purpose for the dinner. She declined his offer, saying "I wasn't comfortable when our last meeting turned into dinner."

- Manweller texted back: “Sorry for that.” His message then asserted that he was having dinner with a person he named from a particular organization and wanted to invite I.A. along. He said: “Here is the job she has not posted but wanted me to give to you” and included a posting. I.A. did not think Manweller’s asserted scenario was real and felt very angry.
- I.A. immediately called the head of her office and looped her in. The next morning, she met with her and the House counsel. The House counsel took down I.A.’s information from start to finish. They told her that the leadership was going to speak with Manweller after she was gone.
- She read Mike Baker’s first Seattle Times article about Manweller on December 6, 2017, and she saw the quote saying: “[Manweller] said no sexual-harassment complaints have been made against him in the Legislature.” I.A. said she contacted Mike Baker because of this lie.
- At a committee meeting during the 2017 legislative session, I.A. helped distribute binders to the members, who were seated on the dais. After the binders were distributed, Manweller made eye contact with I.A. just before she passed behind his seat on the dais. He waited for her to pass and then turned and looked her body down and up. There is a video of the meeting.

1. Witness 1 (W.1.)

W.1. is I.A.’s sister. She confirmed that I.A. had called her the same night she went to the restaurant with Manweller and told W.1.: “I think this guy took me on a date without me knowing it” and “I feel like something inappropriate just happened.” W.1. stated that I.A. described the experience as really weird, and told her how they were at the Capitol, then went to his car, and then went for drinks, where he had been asking her really personal questions. W.1. stated that later, I.A. said she reported him at work.

2. Video

A copy of the video mentioned by I.A. was viewed for the investigation. The moment she referenced was short but consistent with her description.

3. Manweller’s Response

When interviewed for this investigation, Manweller said that I.A. had been in a Douglas Honors College class he taught a decade ago and thus was not one of his normal Political Science students.¹⁰ He reported that after that class, the two of them next interacted at the Legislature in 2017. Manweller said it took a while, but the two of them figured out that he had been her professor.

¹⁰ According to the CWU website, the William O. Douglas Honors College is the University’s premier interdisciplinary program for academically talented students at the University.

Manweller described I.A. as friendly and professional. Manweller denied seeking I.A. out to say hi or chat and said that if he saw her around he did not go out of his way to say hi. He said that he saw her only in committee. Manweller stated that at the end of a hearing, committee members congregate by the staff table, and I.A. sat at the staff table. Manweller said that at the staff table I.A. mentioned to him that she was temporary and would be out of a job at the end of the session.

When asked about I.A.'s claim that she would look up and see him looking at her in meetings, Manweller said that he looks around, and they are two hour meetings. He said he guessed it was possible.

Manweller said that he asked for I.A.'s resume just once. He stated that he told I.A. to send him her resume and he would pass it around. He said he gave I.A.'s resume to a person who hires for partisan positions, and he also introduced her to the State Treasurer Duane Davison. I.A. later sent him an updated resume and asked him to use the revised resume instead.¹¹

Manweller said that he did not remember if he offered to get together with I.A. He also said he did not remember how they exchanged cell phone numbers. Manweller said he did recall having to cancel multiple times before they were able to get together.

When asked if they had agreed on where they would be meeting, Manweller said no, it was pretty vague. He said he thought they were going to get a drink. When asked if they had discussed that or texted about it, Manweller said he did not remember. In regard to whether I.A. had given him any indication that she didn't want to drive anywhere or get a drink, Manweller said she didn't say anything.

Manweller agreed with I.A.'s statement that they had gone to Dillinger's in Olympia. He said that he ordered a drink and food. Manweller stated that I.A. initially indicated that she was fine without ordering anything. Manweller explained that he thought she didn't order anything because she felt like she couldn't afford it, and he felt awkward eating and drinking in front of her. He said when he told her "it's on me," she ordered something.

When asked if he ordered I.A. a drink as she claimed, Manweller said no. He said he told her he would pay, and then she did have something. Manweller stated that he didn't tell the waiter to bring her a drink.

When asked if he remembered their conversation, Manweller asserted that the two of them were kind of catching up since he hadn't seen her since 2008-09. When asked if he had gotten to know her as a student, Manweller said no and noted that I.A. was not one of his Political Science students. He said he just had her for a Douglas Honors College class once a week, and she was only in his class ten times in his entire life.

¹¹ Both I.A. and Manweller provided copies of I.A.'s email sending the revised resume. I.A. said: "I had a few people at OPR [Office of Program Research] look over my resume, and they made some suggestions. So I wanted to pass on my updated resume." Email records showed that she sent him her updated resume a month after the first one.

When asked if the meeting's purpose had been to talk about her career, Manweller said he didn't think it was very defined. He stated that he had passed along her resume and then I.A. indicated she did not want a partisan position. Manweller said he thought they should talk about what she wanted to do. He said he asked I.A. what else she had done other than working for the Legislature. Manweller stated that he remembered that she had done outdoor work, which did not help for a political job.

When asked if he asked I.A. if she lived alone, Manweller said he did not remember. When asked if he asked I.A. if she was dating, he said he did not remember. When asked if it was possible, he said he did not remember, it was just small talk.

Manweller said that I.A. told him she had gotten divorced. When asked if he had asked I.A. if she was unable to have kids, he said he did not remember that. He added that it seemed like he would remember. When asked if he could have asked her this, Manweller said that he did not remember.

When asked if he told the server that he would let the "beautiful woman decide" on dessert, Manweller said he did not remember that. When asked if it was something he might say, he said he did not think so.

When asked if he had poked fun at I.A., Manweller said that he did not remember. When asked if it was possible, he said "I tease people" and reiterated that he did not remember.

This investigator asked Manweller about I.A.'s claim that he had been flirtatious and acting like he was on a date. Manweller contended that he did not know what that means. He said: "I just talk the way I talk." He stated that he did not know what I.A.'s perception was.

When asked if he put I.A.'s jacket on her, Manweller said it might be something he would do. When asked if he opened the door for her, he said yes. When asked if he would open a door for a male, Manweller said: "Probably not. I wasn't raised that way." But he said he would open a door for women. When asked if he opened the car door as well, Manweller said absolutely. He stated that he wouldn't not open the car door.

Manweller described the time he spent with I.A. at Dillinger's as pretty "perfunctual." He characterized it as a brief conversation and emphasized that he has thousands of fifteen minute conversations in the Legislature, most of which are not memorable.

When asked if he thought I.A. would say something that wasn't true, Manweller said he did not know her well enough.

During his interview, this investigator shared with Manweller the copies of text messages that I.A. had provided. He did not give any indication that he questioned their authenticity.

Manweller was asked if he sent the text with the following content: "Hey. Just checking to make sure you made it home safe. You did have a whole vodka tonic and all [smiley face emoji]." He said yes, "that's my personality."

As for the later text to I.A. asking “Do you want to grab dinner??” Manweller said that I.A.’s response (i.e., when she said that she wasn’t comfortable when their last meeting turned into dinner) was his first inclination that she felt that way. He emphasized that he responded back that he was sorry, and he never made more contact with her again.

When asked the reason he did not tell I.A. about the person he wanted to introduce her to in his initial message about grabbing dinner, Manweller said he did not remember. He said that he was sitting with this person at the time, and they were already out.

When asked if anyone at the Legislature had spoken to him, Manweller said that he was spoken to by the minority leader, who said I.A. had mentioned the concerns this investigator had relayed to him during this investigation. Manweller described it as “just a heads up.” When asked if there were any discrepancies between what the minority leader told him and what had been shared with him as part of this investigation, Manweller said he didn’t think so.

During his interview, Manweller was asked if he had reviewed the video identified in the material sent to him a week prior.¹² He said no. Manweller was asked to look at the video after the interview and let this investigator know his perspective.

4. Witness 22 (W.22.)

W.22. is the person who Manweller claimed to have wanted him to give I.A. the job posting that he texted her after asking her if she wanted to grab dinner. At Manweller’s interview for this investigation on June 5, 2018, this investigator indicated a desire to reach out to W.22. Manweller indicated that she was living in a particular location outside of Washington, and he would look for her contact information. On June 7, 2018, this investigator sent an email to Manweller and his representatives asking for follow up on three items, one of which was W.22.’s contact information. Manweller’s attorney promptly responded on the other two items. Neither Manweller nor any of his representatives provided any response on the request for W.22.’s contact information. This investigator located W.22.’s phone number through other sources.

W. 22. attended CWU from 2009-12 and took one class from Manweller in 2012. She is in graduate school and not currently living in Washington.

W.22. has known Manweller as a legislator and has had a professional relationship with him. She worked as a lobbyist in Olympia for about three years. She said she plans to return after she finishes grad school.

W.22. provided this investigator with copies of recent text messages from Manweller, which were consistent with her descriptions (detailed below). They also showed a message Manweller sent to W.22. on December 10, 2017, two days after Dean Englund directed him not to communicate with students and former students during the investigation (i.e., on December 8, 2017). Manweller’s first message to W.22. on December 10 said: “I hear you are getting calls from reporters about me [frowning face emoji]. Anything I should be concerned about?” W.22.

¹² A full week before his interview, Manweller was provided with a link to the video and a specific minute for review.

answered: “Not from me.” He responded back: “Thanks [smiley face emoji with rosy cheeks]. Hope [the place W.22. is living] is a blast!”

At the time of W.22.’s interview for this investigation, she stated that Manweller had called her several days prior, on Wednesday, June 6, 2018, saying it was about an investigation. She said she thought it was a little strange, but he’s someone she expects to have to work with in the future. W.22. shared the following information:

- Manweller started the conversation by telling W.22. that she may be the only person that can help him right now.
- Manweller wanted W.22. to speak to a dinner. He said “remember one night when we had dinner at BroHo.” She thought he was saying it was two years ago. He told her they were at dinner at BroHo and he was texting a female legislative staffer. Manweller told W.22. that while they were there he sent the staffer a job posting from W.22.’s company and said he asked W.22. if it was okay if the staffer came to dinner. She told him she didn’t remember that.
- Manweller then sent her a text to see if it would ring a bell. The transcript he sent looked like a job description she had written and posted for a Facebook networking group. She imagines that she must have sent him a copy of what she’d already written up for the Facebook group. She told him that the text explaining what the job was did ring a bell, as she had written it.
- W.22. felt that Manweller was basically trying to use her as a witness. She told him she couldn’t help him.
- Two days later, on Friday, June 8, 2018, Manweller called her twice, ten minutes apart. She didn’t take his call. She missed another call from him on Tuesday, June 12, 2018.
- After this investigator explained to W.22. that the timing of the evening in question would have been April 2017 (not 2016), W.22. found a posting about the job that she put on Facebook for her networking group on April 19, 2017.
- Based on the April 2017 timeline, W.22. recalled more information. She and Manweller went for drinks on April 19, 2017. W.22. has texts between them from that day, showing communication about getting together and meeting at the sundial. They got drinks at Dillinger’s, not BroHo. She is confident that it was Dillinger’s, because she has photos she took of the chandelier at Dillinger’s on that date.
- At Dillinger’s, they just had drinks and a couple of little appetizers – not dinner. They may have been there two hours. W.22. went to a friend’s house near the Capitol Campus afterward.
- W.22. doesn’t believe she ever told Manweller to send the staffer the job posting. She does not remember talking with Manweller about this specific girl. W.22. didn’t know her from Adam.

- W.22. knows that she didn't say to Manweller: "Hey do you know anyone for this job." It was not like she would go to him and ask him does he know someone for the position. It would have just been "this is happening." She had wanted to offer the job to the previously mentioned Facebook group for networking.
- She does not recall Manweller inviting the staffer to have dinner with them. W.22. would have found that somewhat unusual. She was not in charge of hiring for the position and was not a decision maker.
- Also, W.22. did not have any concern about getting the position filled. It was filled within a day.

During the same interview, W.22. shared:

- When W.22. was at CWU, there was a female student there who seemed to be kind of warning her about Manweller. W.22. identified the name of the student, [Interviewee P or I.P.].
- W.22. and I.P. took an International Politics course. [University records reflect that W.22. and I.P. both took the course from Professor Otopalik in the winter of 2012.] W.22. was about 21 or 22 at the time. W.22. was aware that I.P. had babysat for Manweller.
- There was a particular day when they were waiting to go into the classroom, and I.P. saw an interaction between Manweller and W.22. W.22.'s midriff had been showing a tiny bit. W.22. and I.P. both noticed Manweller looking at W.22.'s body a little bit. After the encounter, I.P. told W.22. to be careful with Manweller.

B. Interviewee B (I.B.)

I.B. reported unwelcome attention from Manweller, including looking at her body. She asserted the following:

- I.B. is a student at CWU and a Political Science major. She took two classes from Professor Manweller, both in the fall of 2017.
- One of those classes was Politics and American Capitalism. A male friend who took the course at the same time told her on multiple occasions that Manweller stared at her in the classroom.
- Although I.B. had not personally noticed the staring described by her friend, she stated that he had brought it up to her as many as seven or eight times. She has known this friend for a number of years, and does not believe he is making anything up.
- If she would have noticed the staring, she would have felt uncomfortable. She finds it obviously inappropriate, inexcusable, and frustrating that Manweller keeps being in

positions of power. I.B. will not be seeking out an opportunity to take another class from him in the future.

1. Witness 2 (W.2.)

W.2. is a student at CWU and a friend of I.B. He took one class with Manweller, Politics and American Capitalism in the fall of 2017. His friend I.B. took the same class. When interviewed for this investigation, W.2. stated that I.B. typically sat in the front of the class, while he sat toward the back.

He said that he observed Manweller staring at I.B. at times, maybe once a week. W.2. noted that it would depend on what she was wearing, i.e., shorter skirts or shirts that were more open on the top. He described the staring as a very hard up and down kind of looking, and it included her whole body. W.2. said that the staring would occur around the end of class when students were packing up and were not really focusing on Manweller. He stated that Manweller would be just standing at the front of the class.

W.2. said he felt a little bothered by Manweller's staring at I.B. and felt like he should tell her – and did. W.2. noted that he had observed Manweller staring at I.B. before he ever heard of the other issues with Manweller, such as the investigations of him.

2. Manweller's Response

When interviewed for this investigation, consistent with what I.B. reported, Manweller stated that I.B. had sat in the front row. He said that he did not remember W.2. Manweller said that he would not seek out I.B. He said he did not remember staring at her body. When asked if it was possible, Manweller said he did not think it was possible that he would stare at I.B. in an inappropriate way in front of twenty other students.

Later, through his attorney, Manweller asked that interviews be conducted with other students from the same Politics and American Capitalism class. He identified two particular students, W.23. and W.26.

3. Witness 23 (W.23.)

W.23. graduated from CWU in the fall of 2017. He took Politics and American Capitalism from Manweller in the fall of 2017 and enjoyed it. When interviewed for this investigation, W.23. estimated that there were no more than twenty people in the class. He stated that he would almost always sit in the same place: in the middle back near the door.

When asked if he noticed what Manweller was doing when class was breaking up, W.23. said that he did not pay much attention to Manweller once class was over, and he doesn't remember seeing anything. He added that he didn't stay around after class, as he usually had back to back classes. W.23. noted that he might ask a real quick question after class, but he normally just left.

W.23. volunteered that there was a female student in the class who wore short skirts and usually had on a nice top. He reported that Manweller paid more attention to her than other students.

W.23. observed that Manweller would make more eye contact with her, look at her more, and look more in her general direction. He stated that he thought that Manweller seemed friendlier to her and seemed like he was trying to connect. W.23. said her first name is [I.B.'s first name]. He noted that Manweller could easily see everyone in the classroom, including I.B. who was in the front row. W.23. stated that Manweller could very easily see her and her skirt and top.

W.23. said that didn't think about it until after he heard about the allegations about Manweller. After the allegations came out, W.23. said he was kind of thinking about Manweller and I.B. at that point and thought it was a bit bothersome.

4. Witness 26 (W.26)

W.26. is the other student from Politics and American Capitalism that Manweller wanted interviewed. W.26. reported that he has known Professor Manweller for a while, as his parent are lobbyists and he worked in Olympia as a lobbyist this past legislative session. When he transferred to CWU, Manweller helped him pick out his classes.

In regard to the Politics and American Capitalism class in the fall of 2017, W.26. said that he probably sat in the same spot every day. He explained that he was in the far left middle row, three rows back, and there were five rows in the classroom. W.26. said that he did not see Manweller look at a female student's body or look at a female student up and down. When asked what he did when the class was over for the day, W.26. said that he packed up his computer and left. He indicated that he did not watch Manweller when the class was over, although he talked to Manweller a few times after class.

According to W.26., after he spoke with this investigator the first time, he talked to his parents to ask if they thought he should call Manweller and tell him that he had talked with the investigator. He said that because they are lobbyists in Olympia, W.26. didn't want to impact the relationship. W.26. explained that he then called Manweller that night to let him know he had talked to the investigator. W.26. stated that Manweller told him that there is a girl who was said to be uncomfortable, and he told W.26. that it was I.B. W.26. said that he shared with Manweller that he had talked to I.B. two weeks before at a party, and he conveyed the general substance of that communication. W.26. said that the following morning, Manweller's lawyer called W.26. and told him he should call the investigator, which he did.

In his second interview, W.26. stated that he talked to I.B. at a party on June 1, 2018. He said that prior to the party, W.26. hadn't really spent time with I.B., and he doesn't really know her that well. He stated that at the party, W.26. and I.B. were standing and talking outside around 10:30 or 11:00 p.m., and it was just the two of them. W.26. said he recalled that in his conversation with I.B., it came up that they are both Political Science majors, and they talked about the class they had taken with Manweller together (Politics and American Capitalism).

According to W.26., I.B. asked if he had heard about the investigation of Manweller. W.26. said that he responded that he was aware of it, but he didn't think Manweller did anything wrong. He maintained that I.B. volunteered that the school had contacted her and told W.26. that Manweller never made her feel uncomfortable. W.26. said that I.B. did not say what she had told the school, and he didn't ask, and that was the extent of their conversation about the investigation of

Manweller. W.26. added that at the time of their conversation, it was his impression that I.B. smelled like alcohol and was clearly not sober.

W.26. said that he sent I.B. a Facebook request a day after the party, but I.B. never responded. W.26. reported that he has not spent time with I.B. or communicated with her (other than the Facebook request) since the night of the party. He stated that no one else has told W.26. that they had a similar conversation with I.B.

Despite multiple attempts, this investigator was unable to reach I.B. to seek a response to W.26.'s information before the investigation report was issued.

C. Interviewee C (I.C.)

I.C. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including sitting down with her at lunch without being invited:

- I.C. is a student at CWU and a Political Science major. She took one course from Manweller, which was in the fall of 2017. During that quarter, I.C. was having lunch in the eating area of the Student Union and Recreation Center by herself. Manweller, with whom she had not had a conversation before, came and sat down with her without asking if he could join her.
- He talked and asked her about her personal life. The questions were more than she felt comfortable talking with a professor about. They included questions about what kind of work she had done and what she wanted to do. I.C. wanted to leave but did not particularly feel like she could. After about twenty minutes, she said she had to finish eating and go to class, and he left.
- I.C. thought it was a weird interaction that was not fully welcome or comfortable. I.C. was concerned that this encounter was related to the fact that she is female. She also did not feel entirely comfortable going to class after that, and she was afraid he would try to have a conversation with her again. I.C. would not take another class from Manweller.

1. Manweller's Response

Manweller acknowledged sitting down and having lunch with I.C. at the SURC. He said he saw her alone and sat down with her. Manweller said he did not remember if she invited him to sit down. He also said he did not remember if he asked if he could sit down. According to him, it was not a memorable conversation. Manweller indicated that he did not see the questions as personal questions. He said he commonly asks what a student wants to do.

Manweller described I.C. as a "pretty hard lefty" whose questions in class could be like cross-examination. He said she was not a big fan of his world view, although she was not disrespectful.

D. Interviewee D (I.D.)

I.D. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including but not limited to complimenting her appearance, unwanted touching, creating situations where she had to spend time with him, and looking at her body. She asserted the following:

- I.D. is a former CWU student who graduated in 2016. She did not take a course from Manweller. I.D. worked at the University's ECLC (Early Childhood Learning Center), where Manweller took his kids. He was aware she was a student and asked her to babysit.
- She babysat for Manweller's boys from approximately November 2015 until June 2016. I.D. estimated the total number of times was around 15 to 20. With perhaps one exception, Manweller's wife would be traveling when I.D. babysat.
- Virtually every time she babysat, Manweller would compliment her appearance. This included telling her how beautiful she is, how hot she is, and that she is a "10." I.D. also recalled him commenting on her yoga pants. She perceived him to be "body scanning" her all the time when he looked at her. I.D. felt the compliments and body scanning were creepy, weird, super inappropriate, and they made her uncomfortable.
- Manweller would initiate hugs goodbye. This happened often, although maybe not every time she babysat. There were times when he would give her a side hug and would not let go. He would put his hand on her lower back and leave his hand there. This happened at least a couple of times. She would let go, and she had the sense that he only let go because she did. I.D. described this touching as creepy, not normal, and a weird thing to do to your babysitter. It made her uncomfortable.
- When Manweller came home, he would talk to her for a really long time – too long for her and up to 30 minutes. I.D. felt this was creepy. At times, when he would come home she would pretend to be on the phone so that she could get out of there. Sometimes she would want to leave but he had not given her her check yet. There were times when she just left without a check so that she could go.
- On one occasion, Manweller made jokes to I.D. that she found weird, like "oh, you could stay over" and "you could stay in the guest room."
- At one point Manweller invited her to go out for drinks. He said something like "I will be at the Starlight if you want to stop by." She did not see this as normal behavior with a babysitter.
- When Manweller would get home, he offered her drinks on almost every occasion.
- On one occasion, which she guessed to be around March 2016, he offered her a glass of wine and she decided to accept. After he got the drinks, she sat at one end of the couch, and he initially was sitting at the other end of the couch. They talked about her school and his work, and he asked her what she wanted to do. He kept inching closer to her, and eventually his hand was touching the side of her knee. She looked down and saw his hand

there, and she is sure she felt it. I.D. felt really weird, upset, and really creeped out. She left and cried all the way home.

- She continued to babysit for Manweller for a few more months because she needed the money.

1. Witness 3 (W.3.)

W.3. is I.D.'s sister. When interviewed for this investigation, W.3. reported that she was aware of I.D. babysitting for Manweller's children. According to W.3., on several occasions, I.D. called her at night after she got done babysitting. W.3. said she recalled I.D. telling her that Manweller touched her when he was talking to her, offered her drinks, and offered for her to stay the night. She described I.D. as weirded out and upset. W.3. said that I.D. conveyed to her that she felt really uncomfortable and awkward and didn't know what to do.

2. Witness 4 (W.4.)

W.4. is a professor at CWU. She teaches in a department other than the Political Science Department. In her interview for this investigation, W.4. reported that a student, I.D., told her that she babysat for Manweller's children a number of times when his wife was not there. She said that I.D. shared with her that Manweller made her feel really uncomfortable. W.4. stated that I.D. described Manweller touching her shoulder, arm, and back and told her about a time when Manweller asked her to go out drinking. W.4. also said that I.D. told her that Manweller would come home and would not let her get away, by not paying I.D. right away; there would be kind of an extended negotiation to get her money and leave. W.4. said that it was her understanding that I.D. cared about the children and was reluctant to say anything.

3. Manweller's Response

When interviewed for this investigation, Manweller said that he knew I.D. worked at the ECLC and was a student at CWU. He explained that he and his wife generally had one core babysitter that they used at a given time; I.D. was such a babysitter. His boys would have been ages 4 and 5 or 5 and 6 when I.D. babysat them.

Manweller indicated that he disagreed with I.D.'s description of who was there when she babysat for his sons. He said that he was not there most of the time. He went on to say that I.D. babysat for his wife as much or more than him. Manweller added that many times they were there together. When asked if there were times when his wife was traveling and only he was there, he said occasionally and said his wife does travel from time to time.

Manweller denied that he complimented I.D.'s looks. He denied telling her she was beautiful or hot. When asked if he told her she was a "10," he said he would not say that. He further denied commenting on her clothes and said he did not know what yoga pants are.

He said he did not recall ever body scanning I.D. He said it was the first time he had heard the term body scanning.

Regarding the hugs and related touching, Manweller said it was not like I.D. described. He said that a lot of times I.D. initiated hugs with him, his wife, and his boys. Manweller stated that he did not give I.D. an inappropriate hug. He added that it was hard to remember the nature of a hug from three years ago.

When asked about talking with I.D. when he got home, Manweller stated that they have a “policy” that babysitters arrive fifteen minutes before he/they left and stay 15 minutes after he/they got home. He referred to this as a “transitional period,” because the kids have separation anxiety. He said it was a time that they could all be together and then sneak out. He said the babysitters knew about this policy.

Manweller said that because his boys have [a food-related health condition and a serious allergic condition], he would do a twenty minute walk through of their food and medicine. He indicated that he did this even if the babysitter already knew the boys. He said it was mostly to be there a certain amount of time.

He was asked whether the boys would sometimes be asleep when he got home, given their young ages (four and five or five and six). He said yes. He was asked if the babysitter would not need to stay for the 15 minutes after he got home if the kids were asleep. Manweller said no, they would still do that, because he would want a debrief (e.g., “Any meltdowns?” “Any fights?”). He described it as “our standard practice.”

When asked if I.D. was ever on the phone when he got home and stayed on the phone as she left, Manweller said no, never. He said he would remember if she had been on the phone. He asserted that it would probably be inappropriate for I.D. to be on the phone. Manweller added that he would have talked to her about it. When asked if it was not okay for her to be on the phone even if the boys were asleep, he said probably. He said texting was maybe okay but not being on the phone.

As for joking about I.D. staying overnight, Manweller said he did not remember specifically. He said there were times when she was leaving late at night and needed to be back early in the morning, and it was just a joke. He noted that she did not stay over.

Manweller said that he never invited I.D. to drinks. When asked if he suggested she stop by the Starlight, he said he did not remember that.

Manweller said that he would occasionally offer her a drink or his wife would offer. He said he did not offer I.D. a drink every time. Manweller indicated that I.D. would accept a drink most of the time.

When asked about I.D.’s claim about him touching her knee on the couch, Manweller responded that he lived in the Olympia area in March 2016. He explained that for the 2016 legislative session, he worked long days and did not leave Olympia from early January until

about mid-April.¹³ He said his wife would bring the kids down to him. Manweller provided a document that showed the dates the Legislature was in session in 2016.

He was asked if the situation with him touching I.D.'s knee on the couch ever happened. Manweller said no, but he might have offered I.D. a glass of wine.

Manweller indicated that things with I.D. ended cordially, and they got her a graduation gift.

4. Interviewee D – Additional Information

Following the interview of Manweller, this investigator followed up with I.D. to ask her about some of the things he had said. I.D. shared the following:

- Manweller's statement that most of the time he wasn't there when she babysat is not accurate. It was always him except one time.
- A policy that as the babysitter she was expected to arrive 15 minutes before his departure and stay 15 minutes after he came home was never, ever said. The kids already knew her from school and previous babysitting.
- In regard to the assertion that Manweller would do a twenty minute walk through of the boys' food and medicine even if the babysitter already knew them, I.D. said this was not true. The kids did have [a food-related health condition] and a bunch of allergies, but she already knew this. The first time she babysat, Manweller showed her their meds. They were over the counter meds before bed, and it was super casual.¹⁴ It was only the first time she babysat that he mentioned their meds.
- He would have food for the kids in the fridge. There was no unsafe food in the house. He would open the fridge and say they can eat this.
- Manweller's claim of having a "standard practice" of having the sitter stay for fifteen minutes after he returned home was not accurate. Manweller did not ask her about the boys' behavior, but she would offer that information.
- There was no rule about not being able to talk on the phone while she was there.
- The Manwellers did leave for Olympia to live there for a period of time. It might have been a full three months.
- I.D. definitely babysat the boys in March. There was a guy she started talking/texting to in March of 2016 and she remembers being at Manweller's at this time.

¹³ A subsequent email from Manweller's attorney on June 8, 2018 characterized Manweller's return to Ellensburg as "early April."

¹⁴ After I.D. asked about an epi pen, Manweller showed it to her and told her that they had never used it.

- In her initial interview I.D. had guessed that the incident with him touching her knee on the couch happened in March. She remembers it being a few months before graduation. It is possible that it was in April.

5. Witness 25 (W.25.)

W.25. works at the Early Childhood Learning Center (ECLC) affiliated with CWU. Following his interview for this investigation, Manweller – through his attorney – asked that W.25. be interviewed. This request was based on an assertion that W.25. would “offer significant, relevant observations and comments regarding [I.D.’s] behavior during the timeframe in which she made her allegations against Dr. Manweller.” It was further requested that W.25. be asked “whether [I.D.] made any allegations and/or accusations against anyone else that W.25. believes were strange and/or unfounded.”

When W.25. was interviewed, the information she provided was not consistent with what Manweller’s attorney described. W.25. indicated that she had worked at the ECLC for a number of years. She confirmed that I.D. used to work for the ECLC and babysat for the Manwellers quite frequently in 2015-16. When asked if I.D. had made an allegation against someone that W.25. found strange or unfounded, W.25. said no. W.25. indicated that dishonesty had not been an issue with I.D.

W.25. said that I.D. initially worked at the ECLC from March to June 2013 and returned in September 2013. She said that after one of I.D.’s family members passed away, she suggested that I.D. take some time off. W.25. provided information reflecting that I.D. took time off starting in November 2014 and returned to work at the ECLC in September 2015. She continued working there until she graduated in June 2016. W.25. did not share information about unusual behavior in 2015-16.

W.25. said that she has not had employees raise concerns to her about personal experiences with Manweller. However, she volunteered that [during a timeframe around late May 2018] one of the ECLC student employees told W.25. that Manweller and his wife were looking for a babysitter for an overnight and called the babysitter list. This employee wanted W.25. to know that she would never do an overnight for them. This employee also said that there were a couple of other student employees who told her they would not babysit for the Manwellers overnight.

E. Interviewee E (I.E.)

I.E. reported unwelcome attention from Manweller, including but not limited to looking at her body and sending her unnecessary email correspondence. She asserted the following:

- I.E. attended CWU at a satellite campus. She interned at the Washington Legislature for the 2015 session.
- On October 6, 2015, I.E. visited the Ellensburg campus with the Psychology Club from her satellite campus. They went to meet with professors from the Psychology Department.

- At some point following their arrival, I.E. saw Manweller talking with their host professor, who introduced them. She and Manweller exchanged pleasantries for a short time. She told him that she had interned for a particular state senator, a Democrat. He did not talk to other students from their group.
- After her interaction with Manweller, more than one of I.E.'s fellow students told her that Manweller had been totally checking her out, including when she walked away.
- I.E. said that she does not doubt that Manweller was looking at her body as described. It was completely unwelcome, and everything about it – the venue, the time, the power dynamic, him being an authority figure – was inappropriate.
- Around lunchtime, the group had a pizza gathering on the second floor of the student union building, and they invited professors from the Psychology Department. Manweller showed up at the pizza gathering and told I.E. he just wanted to make sure she had his Legislature business card. I.E. gave him her card with her personal email address on it. She does not think he talked to other students at that time.
- That same night, Manweller sent I.E. an email message from his personal email account stating:

It was nice meeting you today. Thanks for making the trip all the way over to Ellensburg. Just wanted you to have my contact information that was not related to the Legislature. Hope you made it back safe. Feel free to contact me if you ever need [any]thing.

- I.E. found it weird for him to send this email and give her his personal contact information. From her perspective, there was no obvious need for them to network, since they did not share the same political party or arm of the Legislature. She was pretty taken aback and did not respond. She did not view his actions as professional or appropriate. I.E. later notified the House intern coordinator at the Legislature via email.

I.E. provided copies of the email from Manweller and the email correspondence with the House intern coordinator. The Psychology professor I.E. described as hosting the visit confirmed that the group came, and he gave them a campus tour.

1. Witness 5 (W.5.)

W.5. was one of the students from the satellite campus who accompanied I.E. on the visit to the Ellensburg campus in October 2015. W.5. reported that a male professor – she thinks he was from Political Science – was being especially creepy towards I.E. W.5. stated that when she saw I.E. and the professor talking, he seemed overly interested and was just a little too physically close to her. W.5. said her very first thought was “creep.”

W.5. shared that when I.E. and the professor had finished speaking, I.E. came over to talk and leave with W.5. and the rest of the group. W.5. said that as I.E. walked away from the professor,

he would not stop staring at her and her rear end, despite the fact that W.5. and possibly others were looking her direction in anticipation of her rejoining the group. According to W.5., she told I.E. that the professor would not stop staring at her and her rear end. She said she pointed out to I.E. that he didn't break eye contact with her bottom.

W.5. reported that the professor's behavior made I.E. really uncomfortable. She said that I.E. told her that other students had also brought up his inappropriate behavior to her.

2. Witness 6 (W.6.)

W.6. formerly served as the intern coordinator for the Senate side of the Washington Legislature and met I.E. when she interned for the Senate. W.6. stated that I.E. told her that she met Manweller on a group trip to the Ellensburg campus. She said that I.E. also told her that he came to their group later in the day and gave her his contact information, and then emailed her that evening. W.6. said she told the House intern coordinator, and then the Clerk's Office wanted her to get the record. She said she asked I.E. to forward the email to the House intern coordinator.

3. Manweller's Response

When interviewed, Manweller said that he did not remember I.E.'s name, although he did remember the day that she described. He said that he was in the hallway and one of the Psychology professors, whom he identified by name, was teasing him about being a state representative. (This was not the host professor that I.E. had mentioned.) According to Manweller, this Psychology professor told him there was a person interested in working in the Legislature. Manweller said that he did an impromptu Q&A with the visiting students. He indicated that he did not remember what the questions were or whether he talked to I.E.

Manweller said he does not know W.5. When asked if he stared at I.E.'s rear end, Manweller said he didn't think that happened. He did not clearly deny it.

Manweller acknowledged that at some point he and I.E. exchanged business cards. He said he did not remember where this occurred or what she said, although she told him she was looking for a job. He maintained that he did not remember going to pizza. Manweller indicated that he did not remember her talking about the internship she had done at the Legislature or which state senator she worked for.

He said the content of the email was accurate. When asked what his reason was for giving I.E. his personal email, Manweller said that a year earlier he was called into the Dean's office, because he had received political email at his CWU account. According to Manweller, Dean Johnson suggested that receiving such email constituted use of CWU email for political resources. When asked why he thought I.E. needed to contact him at his personal email account rather than at the Legislature, he said he was very cautious at this point and thought that Gmail was safer.

4. Documentation of Manweller's CWU Email Issue

Documentation provided by the University reflected that in the summer of 2013, Dean Kirk Johnson notified Manweller that he was considering disciplinary action for Manweller's actions involving CWU email. A July 15, 2013 letter to Manweller reflected that, in contrast to what Manweller had said in his interview for this investigation, the focus was not political emails received by Manweller at his CWU account. Rather, at issue were two different political emails sent by Manweller to two CWU employees at their CWU email accounts. The report of investigation dated October 7, 2013 stated that Dean Johnson decided not to pursue disciplinary action, because he could not determine how the two employees' CWU email accounts had been added to Manweller's political mailing lists.

5. Witness 24 (W.24.)

W.24. is a Psychology professor at CWU. He was contacted for this investigation at Manweller's request, based on Manweller's contention that W.24. was the professor who was conducting the group tour and led an impromptu question and answer session that Manweller gave the students in the hallway. Manweller contended that W.24. was an eyewitness to the interaction between him and the participants in the Q&A session, including I.E.

When interviewed, W.24. explained that he had limited interactions with the Psychology Club and stated that he is very sure that he did not have a role in the visit of the Psychology Club from the satellite campus to the Ellensburg campus in October 2015. In regard to whether he gave a tour to the visiting students and witnessed Manweller engage in an impromptu Q&A with the group, W.24. said absolutely not. He indicated that he can't imagine it is something he would ever do, and it seemed weird to him on a lot of levels. W.24. noted that Manweller has nothing to do with Psychology. In regard to the investigation of Manweller, W.24. said that he does not see himself as unbiased. He respects Manweller as a colleague, likes him as a friend, and has never seen any evidence of Manweller doing anything like what he's been accused of. According to W.24., he believes that the University is on a witch hunt.

F. Interviewee F (I.F.)

I.F. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including but not limited to looking at her body. She asserted the following:

- I.F. was a CWU student in 2013-14.
- In the winter of 2014, I.F. attended a legislative reception in Olympia, Washington. Manweller attended, as did President Gaudino, Trustees, and politicians.
- I.F. met Manweller for the first time at this event. She felt very "hit upon" by him. Manweller was not looking her in the eye, and his focus was on her chest rather than on her face. I.F. described his look as "examining." Although he did not touch her, he was very "in her face" and physically close to her, in her personal bubble.

- While focused on her chest, Manweller said they were going to work really close together and told her that they needed to get to know each other better. This struck I.F. as a bad pickup line, as there was no agenda or project they were going to be working on together.
- Terms and phrases I.F. used in describing the encounter included gross, sexually motivated, creeped out, and devalued. The interaction lasted five to ten minutes, when I.F. left the conversation abruptly.

1. Event Details

Kim Dawson, Executive Assistant to the University President and Board of Trustees, provided the date, location, and sponsor of the event. The Council of Presidents for Regional Universities held a legislative reception on January 22, 2014, at La Petite Maison in Olympia, Washington. When asked if this was the event she was referring to, I.F. confirmed that it was.

2. Manweller's Response

Manweller said he did not remember I.F., although he remembered the event because the room was small. When asked if he stood close to her, leaned in, and focused on I.F.'s chest, Manweller said he did not think that happened. He did not specifically deny it. When he was asked about I.F.'s statements about feeling "hit upon" and his behavior being "sexually motivated," Manweller said he did not know what that means. He said you talk to people and move on. When asked about the communication that I.F. characterized as a bad pick up line, he said that doing a project would be up to the student, if they were asking for something.

G. Interviewee G (I.G.)

I.G. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including but not limited to unwanted touching, asking personal questions, and proposing sex in exchange for an educational benefit. She asserted the following:

- I.G. enrolled in one class with Manweller in the spring of 2009. She was a 19 year old single mom with a three year old son.
- Near the beginning of the quarter that I.G. took his class, Manweller told her he could write her a good recommendation letter for law school. It occurred to her that at the beginning of the course, he would not have known what kind of student she was. There was another occasion when she overheard him offer a letter of recommendation to a young female student one night when I.G. was working at an event center. She thought that offering female students letters of recommendation in this way seemed inappropriate and something he could hold over people, like "you need me."
- During the quarter she took Manweller's class, I.G.'s three year old son had to be hospitalized, impacting her attendance. After Manweller knew she was behind in his class, he offered to get drinks with her at the Starlight, she thinks two times. It struck her as odd, because she didn't know him well.

- After Manweller told I.G. he could meet with her in the evening, she went to his office, arriving at 5:30 or 6:00. Manweller closed the office door behind her. When she sat down, he pulled up a chair right next to her on her right side. There was no need to be that close.
- Manweller immediately asked her how her dating life was as a single mom, which put her on edge. In a tone she perceived as flirtatious, Manweller kept talking about her being so young and courageous and saying that it must be hard.
- Manweller leaned in a little bit closer and put his hand on her right knee. His palm was open and face-down. As he put his hand on her knee, he said: “There’s always a way for you to get an A in this class.” He also made another statement similar to this one that conveyed the same message, although she no longer recalls the words he used. It was clear to her that he was offering her other ways to earn an A that did not involve course work, and understood this to mean a sexual favor for an easy A. I.G. did not think that he may have meant something else. She walked out.
- She felt offended and in shock and felt that he had absolutely crossed the line.
- I.G. withdrew from Manweller’s course immediately. If this incident in Manweller’s office had not happened, she would have finished his class. It was the only class she ever withdrew from in college, and she finished other course work that same quarter.
- Manweller later emailed her asking about anything he could help with and her son. She does not remember if there was more than one message.¹⁵

1. Witness 7 (W.7.)

W.7. is I.G.’s sister. When interviewed for this investigation, W.7. said she remembered that I.G.’s son was at Children’s Hospital for a while. She said she recalled I.G. telling her about her experience with Manweller when it happened. Although W.7. said she does not remember the specifics, the gist was a sexual advance. According to W.7., I.G. was angry and pissed off about it. She said that I.G. had never had to drop a class, and this was the only class she dropped in college. W.7. said her understanding was that I.G. didn’t want to risk a bad grade by not going along with what Manweller wanted. W.7. emphasized that I.G. was really, really proud of her grades.

She further reported that I.G. brought the experience up again after W.7. got to know Manweller’s wife, Shelley. W.7. said she had not known Shelley at the time of the incident [in 2009]. She stated that when W.7. and her husband had a coffee shop, Shelley and the boys became customers of the shop. W.7. said I.G. then reminded her: “Don’t you remember, she’s married to that guy . . .” W.7. thinks this was in 2011.

¹⁵ I.G. said she attempted to locate these messages, but her account did not go back far enough.

2. University Records

University records confirmed that in the spring quarter of 2009, I.G. dropped Manweller's class and finished the other courses in which she was enrolled. University records further confirmed that I.G. did not withdraw from other courses while at CWU.

3. Manweller's Response

When interviewed, Manweller reported that he knows I.G. and her family, and knew her before she took his class. He said that I.G. is the daughter of a friend he knows through politics.

When asked if he offered I.G. a letter of recommendation at the beginning of the quarter, Manweller said he did not remember. When asked if there were situations where he would offer a student a letter early on, Manweller said yes. He explained that if a student says s/he wants to go to grad school or law school, he will say that he can write a letter. When asked if he would offer this even if it was early on, Manweller said the better the student, the better the letter. He went on to say that generally if they say they want to pursue grad school, he will say "I'll write you a letter." He said he will encourage them.

When asked about I.G.'s statement that she had heard him offer a female a letter at a particular event center, Manweller said he had been to the event center I.G. cited. When asked again if he had offered a female student a letter of recommendation there, Manweller said he did not remember and did not think he could add anything to that.

When asked about I.G.'s characterization that a letter was something he could hold over someone, Manweller said that was absolutely not true. He said he would never hold a letter over someone. Manweller stated that the goal is to make students successful and get them into grad school or law school.

Manweller stated that he remembered I.G.'s three year old son being in a terrible medical situation and I.G. going to Children's to spend the night all the time. He said that I.G. had let him know, plus he also knew from I.G.'s dad. Manweller explained that it was not a situation where he did not believe I.G.

Manweller indicated that I.G. did get behind in his class. He said he never offered to get drinks with her. Manweller added that he had *never* invited a student out for drinks.

Manweller stated that I.G. came to his office at least twice to tell him about problems she was having and why she missed so many days of class, tests, and assignments. He said she also talked about her son and how hard it was to go to school with a sick son. Manweller said I.G. told him: "I'm going to fail." In his interview, Manweller shared options he may offer students for make-up work or extra credit under certain types of circumstances. Manweller said that he did not remember what happened with I.G., but he did not think they worked it out and did not think she passed. When asked if she withdrew, he said he did not remember but thought that there should be a record.

When asked if he closed the office door and pulled his chair close to I.G., Manweller said that where he sits in his office is not close enough to touch somebody. He stated that he has a huge desk with two chairs. He drew a diagram on a piece of paper at the request of this investigator. He showed his “big” chair behind his desk, with the desk facing the side wall and his back to the other side wall. He drew an end table and two wicker chairs by the window. Manweller said that the student typically sits in the far chair. He indicated a limited ability to move his chair close to the wicker chairs, in part based on the location of the end table. When asked if he ever sat in the second wicker chair near the visitor, Manweller said no. He indicated that he has not changed the furniture since 2004, and he has been in the same office that whole time.

When asked if Manweller had talked to I.G. about her dating life and being a single mom, Manweller said he did not remember. He stated that I.G. conveyed that she was a single mom trying to raise a kid while he was sick. When asked if he had a response to I.G.’s claim about talking to her about her dating life and being a single mom, he said no.

In regard to I.G.’s contention that he talked to her in a flirtatious tone and talked about her being young and courageous, Manweller said that he had only a broad recollection of the conversation, the general nature of it being the trouble she was going through. He described her as very stressed.

He denied touching I.G.’s knee. When asked if he had told her that there was always a way for her to get an A in this class, Manweller responded that he did not remember saying that to I.G. He said he did not remember the specifics of the conversation at all, and it would never be a quid pro quo.

He said if he says “you can pass the class,” that is a statement of fact. Manweller said that students will tell him: “I’m going to fail.” He said he will tell them “don’t panic” and say “there’s always a way for you to pass.” He said it was not a quid pro quo, and he was very sorry if I.G. took it that way. Manweller stated that he will not say it again. He said it never occurred to him that someone would take it that way. He said he did not think he says there is always a way to get an A, because there is not always a way to get an A; that would just be setting himself up.

When asked about subsequent email messages to I.G., Manweller said he did not have any. When asked if the messages fit with the circumstances, he said he didn’t know and didn’t remember.

Manweller volunteered that W.7. and his wife are pretty good friends and have sons the same age. He described W.7. as on the “other side of the political spectrum.” Manweller said he and W.7. had had Facebook “fights” (debates) once in a while.

4. Current Office Arrangement

Photos of Manweller’s office taken in June 2018 subsequent to his June 5, 2018 interview showed a furniture layout essentially consistent with Manweller’s drawing.

5. Interviewee G – Additional Information

I.G. was contacted following Manweller's interview to ask what she recalled about the layout of his office. She provided the following information:

- I.G. does not recall Manweller's office being set up like the diagram she was sent [the drawing by Manweller from June 5, 2018].
- Her recollection of the office is captured in a diagram she submitted. She believes the colors were dark oak.

Unlike Manweller's drawing, which showed his desk and chair facing toward the side wall with the bookshelves, I.G.'s diagram showed his desk in front of the window, with his chair behind it facing away from the window and toward the door. She drew two chairs in front of the desk. I.G. also shared the following:

- The chair he was sitting in was not his big chair from behind his desk. While her drawing may not be 100%, she does know without a doubt that Manweller had two chairs on the other side of his desk. She sat in one of them, and there was a door behind her.
- I.G. remembers there being an end table with a lamp on it and a bookshelf with a large amount of books.
- She was sitting on the left chair near the end table. From what she recalls, the right chair initially was more to the side of the desk on the right. When he pulled the right chair close, then both I.G. and Manweller were seated in the two chairs between the desk and the door. I.G. remembers him moving the chair close to her in a slight angled way, where their knees were very close to each other and within arm length, because he placed his left hand on her right thigh/knee area.
- The entire situation was a slight blur and surreal, and during that moment she wasn't paying much attention to her surroundings.

H. Interviewee H (I.H.)

I.H. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including but not limited to compliments about her appearance, asking personal questions, unwanted touching, and romantic overtures. She asserted the following:

- I.H. graduated from CWU in 2009. She never took a class from Manweller. During her senior year, she worked on a senior research project with a Political Science professor, W.8. In the winter of 2009, she completed an independent study related to her research paper. In May 2009, I.H. presented her paper at CWU's SOURCE Symposium.¹⁶

¹⁶ SOURCE stands for Symposium on University Research and Creative Expression.

- W.8. recommended that I.H. reach out to Manweller, because the subject matter of her paper was related to Manweller's area of focus.
- I.H. had not yet reached out to Manweller when he stopped her in the hall. He said W.8. told him there was a student doing research and he would be happy to talk with her. I.H. did not know how Manweller knew who she was, as she did not know him before.
- When she went to his office, I.H. felt Manweller was hitting on her the entire meeting. He was flirting in the way he was speaking to her. This included several direct comments about how attractive she was and how unusual it was to have an attractive woman interested in the Political Science field/area. I.H. was a single parent at the time. Manweller asked her about her dating life, including whether she was with the father of her child. I.H. felt uncomfortable, and she could not wait to go. There were a couple of times when she tried to wrap up, but he kept trying to keep the conversation going.
- Several times after the meeting in his office, Manweller would be in the hallway when I.H. would be getting out of class. She did not think he had a reason to be there, and I.H. had not seen him much before this. He would always say hi and would walk with her wherever she was headed. This happened five to ten times over a period of weeks or possibly a couple of months.
- He asked her to go to lunch at least twice. When they finally went to lunch, it was a few days before she would present at the Symposium. She agreed because his idea was that the focus of the lunch would be how to present her project.
- Manweller chose the restaurant, which I.H. characterized as fine dining and like a bistro. She said it was called Sazon. When she arrived he was already seated. He stood and grabbed her elbow/arm, as though he were helping her to sit. He was also trying to lean in for an awkward side hug. He said something about her looking nice.
- The focus of the lunch was not advice on how to present her project at the Symposium. Manweller told I.H. that he could not stop thinking about her and talked about how much he thought about her. He said he was dreaming about her. He said he wanted to run away with her. He told her he knew how wrong it was or how much trouble he could get in. This went on for some time. She ate very quickly and left the restaurant.
- Manweller walked after her. In the parking lot, he yelled after her: "Don't go." When she was getting into her car, he grabbed her on the forearm and she pushed him off. She thought he was trying to kiss her.
- She felt confused and in shock. The experience was unexpected, especially because it was not as though the two of them had talked a lot before this.
- Over the next couple of months and year, Manweller tried to contact I.H. on Facebook a few times. She does not remember what he said. It was a "can we talk" type of thing. She responded to only one message he sent about a year later. Manweller's message said he

heard she was interviewed for a job with someone he knew, and she sent a response saying yes and that was about it.¹⁷

1. Witness 8 (W.8.)

W.8. is a Political Science professor at CWU. When interviewed for this investigation, he said he recalled I.H. and her project. Specifically, he indicated that in the fall of 2008, I.H. did an internship with the county auditor. In the winter of 2009, I.H. did an independent study with W.8. to revise her research paper or something along these lines. W.8. recalled that the focus of her paper was somewhat related to a topic on which Manweller had done research or been involved with. He said I.H. would have presented at SOURCE in the spring of 2009.¹⁸

W.8. said he did not have a specific recollection of referring I.H. to Manweller. However, given I.H.'s internship-to-SOURCE project on her particular topic and some of Manweller's work in the area, W.8. said his supposition was that he may well have referred I.H. to Manweller for additional expert advice.¹⁹ W.8. stated that if he did refer I.H. to Manweller and that led to some "incident," he would feel upset, if not infuriated. He said he does not remember I.H. raising with him a specific allegation about Manweller – and if she did, he would have remembered.²⁰ W.8. indicated that he does not know of any reason I.H. would make something up that was not true.

2. Manweller's Response

Manweller said that W.8. put them together, although he does not remember how he and I.H. met. He recalled the particular topic of her paper and said they worked together on her SOURCE project. Manweller said that he remembered meeting with I.H. a few times. He said it was late – like the last three weeks of school. While Manweller remembered her topic, he said that he did not remember her paper or the type of stuff that she was asking him about. He added that he has not been involved with SOURCE that much.

When asked about I.H.'s description of their meeting in his office, Manweller said he did not think that happened. He said if there was something unusual in a conversation he would remember. He estimated he had had a thousand student conversations in sixteen or seventeen years.

Manweller denied telling I.H. how attractive she was. As for asking about her dating life as a single mom and whether she was with the father of her child, Manweller said he did not remember any conversation of that nature.

¹⁷ I.H. said she is no longer active on Facebook and did not have copies of the messages.

¹⁸ A program from the 2009 SOURCE Symposium included I.H. and her presentation.

¹⁹ W.8. said that he would have done this the same way he would refer a student to another faculty member who might know more than W.8. about a particular area.

²⁰ I.H. said that she may have mentioned what happened with Manweller to W.8., but she was not sure.

When asked about I.H.'s claim that there had been five to ten occasions when she saw him after a class and he walked with her, Manweller said no. He said his office and classroom are in the Psychology/Political Science building and all basically on the fourth floor. Manweller stated that he did not understand her reference to five to ten occasions. He asserted that his interaction with I.H. was very limited and occurred over three weeks tops. Manweller said it was just a last minute SOURCE thing.

Manweller agreed that he and I.H. did have lunch one time. However, he said they went to a place called Wings, which he characterized as not fancy. Manweller described it as close – thirty yards off campus. Manweller reported that I.H. stopped by his office. He said he told her he was starving and asked “can we do this while we’re eating.” Manweller stated that they ran down to Wings, driving in his car together and returning together. He said it was not a case of him arriving before, and there was no reason to grab her arm and no chasing her. He said he did not go after her or yell after her. According to Manweller, he did not remember the conversation at lunch at all and had no idea what they talked about. At the same time, he said there was no discussion about him not being able to stop thinking about her.

Manweller stated that he had looked for Facebook messages but could not find any. He said he tried under both I.H.'s name while she was at CWU and her current last name. Manweller stated that he did not remember a subsequent follow up message regarding a job interview. He said it was not enough to trigger a memory.

I. Interviewee I (I.I.)

I.I. described attention from Manweller that was not unwelcome at the time it occurred. Now she views some of that behavior as inappropriate. She asserted the following:

- I.I. attended CWU from 2004-08. I.I. took a few classes from Manweller. These included classes in the winter of 2005, the winter of 2007, the summer of 2007, and the spring of 2008.
- I.I. characterized the interaction she had with Manweller as an inappropriate friendship. The interaction was consensual at the time, but now she feels that it was inappropriate and emotionally manipulative. Manweller was in a position of power over her, and she wanted his approval. I.I. believes that Manweller should have known this kind of attention was unhealthy for a 20-21 year old to have at a university with a person in power.
- Before she had spent much time with Manweller, there was an occasion when she saw him in the Political Science office. He grabbed her knee, with his palm fully clasped around it, and said “really nice to see you” in a slow suggestive tone. When it happened, I.I. found this behavior really bold, although she does not recall it making her feel uncomfortable at that time.
- After she turned 21 in mid-March of her junior year (2007), I.I. had drinks (alcohol) with Manweller around once a month, sometimes one on one but usually with a particular

female friend, I.K., there as well. Some of the times when they went drinking I.I. was enrolled in his class.²¹

- Manweller would often talk about sex and ask I.I. and I.K. about their sex lives. For example, if I.I. slept with a fellow student, he would press for more information and want to know how it was. This happened multiple times.
- Manweller would often make inappropriate comments about men wanting to date her.
- A lot of I.I.'s one on one interactions with Manweller occurred in his office. He was very flirtatious and playful and would use very suggestive flattering tones. Although there were times when they did some work in his office, it was almost all flirtatious.
- I.I. now views Manweller's conduct as grooming behavior. He would flatter her to the point where she would open up and share with him. These conversations usually led to inappropriate conversations that she felt he could potentially use against her.
- There was an occasion when I.I. traveled to an out-of-town conference with some other Political Science students. There were three or four other female students there who were laughing about comments Manweller had made about their appearances, for example, complimenting their legs and dresses.
- After she finished her last quarter at CWU, I.I. was at The Tav with a group of friends. Manweller taught one of the classes that she had just finished. Manweller came up to her at The Tav and whispered in her ear that he had just posted grades and said her grade. I.I. perceived his intent to be telling her they were no longer teacher and student, although he didn't use those words.

1. Manweller's Response

When interviewed about I.I., Manweller said he remembers her well. He added that they had stayed in touch and had been friends until a week before. He said they had been in touch by email six months ago.

When asked about I.I.'s assertion that they had had an inappropriate friendship, Manweller said he didn't know what that means. Manweller acknowledged that he and I.I. had been friends outside of class. He volunteered that he was also friends with I.I.'s father, who had dinner at Manweller's house four months before his interview.

When asked about I.I.'s account of him grabbing her knee, Manweller said he did not remember. He added that he did not believe that happened. He said he could not offer any insight.

²¹ I.I. would have turned 21 near the end of the winter quarter of 2007. Based on University records, she subsequently took two courses with Manweller, one in the summer of 2007 and another in the spring of 2008.

Manweller acknowledged having drinks with I.I. He said he did not remember if it had happened during times when she had been taking his class. Manweller maintained that he never invited students out for drinks. He said he would be out, and they would also be there, and they would spontaneously join him. Manweller said that there are about four establishments in the small town (including the Starlight and The Tav), so he is bound to run into people. He said he would bump into both I.I. and I.K. at the Starlight and chat.

When asked if he talked about sex with I.I., Manweller did not say no. Rather, he said he did not remember the nature of the conversation eleven years ago. When asked about occasions when I.I. would tell him she slept with a student, and then Manweller asked her how it was, he said he did not remember that. He described it as just casual out-at-a-bar conversation. Manweller added that I.I. was a very gregarious person.

Manweller said that he could recall a handful of conversations with I.I. He described them as deeply personal on her part – but not his. Manweller said after that sort of conversation, the nature of their future conversations was not “hey how’s it going.” He said that when they would be out and about and he would run into her, they would talk.

When asked if he made comments about men wanting to date her, Manweller said he could not offer a specific recollection of conversations at a bar. As to whether they spent time at other places off campus, he said he did not remember, although he did remember the Starlight from time to time.

Manweller acknowledged that I.I. would come to his office. He stated that he did not remember what brought her there. When asked if he had been flirting, flattering, and/or suggestive, Manweller said that he did not remember those conversations – no.

As to I.I.’s claim of “grooming behavior,” Manweller said he did not know what that means. After this investigator explained what I.I. had said, Manweller stated that he did not have anything to add on that.

In regard to the information I.I. provided about hearing other female students talk about Manweller complimenting their legs and dresses, Manweller said that he assumed the trip was to Las Vegas. He said that he never attended those trips and said a different Political Science professor went. When asked directly if he gave compliments like this to female students, Manweller said no.

As for I.I.’s account of him whispering her grade to her at The Tav, Manweller said he had no recollection but said he was sorry I.I. perceived it that way if he said that. He noted that he receives numerous questions in the last weeks of school, when students are asking when grades are going to be out.

At Manweller’s interview, his attorney provided a copy of a LinkedIn request from I.I. to Manweller from 2016.

J. Interviewee K (I.K.)

I.K. described attention from Manweller that was not unwelcome at the time it occurred. Now she views some of that behavior as inappropriate. She asserted the following:

- I.K. was a student at CWU from 2003 to 2007. She majored in Political Science. She took a few classes from Manweller.
- When she was a senior at CWU (age 21-22), sometimes I.K. and her friend I.I. would get drinks with Manweller at the Starlight. Manweller invited I.K. and I.I. to go for drinks and paid for their drinks. They drank with him a half dozen times at the most. I.K. does not think they went drinking with him while she was taking a class from him. I.K. did not meet Manweller for drinks one on one.
- When I.K. and I.I. were drinking with him, there was some touching of I.K. by Manweller, including her thigh, hair, shoulder, and waist. Manweller would talk about and compliment her body and say he was attracted to women with her hair color.
- There was also talk about sex. Manweller was very interested in how and when I.K. and I.I. lost their virginity. He was interested in guys they were dating or sleeping with and also interested in whether I.K. and I.I. were taking birth control. Manweller talked about sex and his days in college, although I.K. does not recall any particular details he shared.
- At the time, I.K. never felt uncomfortable with the aforementioned interactions. She did not see the relationship as him being in a place of power. Reflecting on this now, while Manweller's behavior was not unwelcome, it was not appropriate. She thinks he should have known better.
- I.K. and Manweller kept in touch sporadically after she graduated. Manweller has texted her a few times since December 2017; the most recent occasion was in mid-May 2018. Manweller indicated that he wanted to get together with her and asked her about her new job. I.K. did not agree to get together.

1. Witness 9 (W.9.)

W.9. teaches at the University and knew I.K. when she was a student there. According to W.9., in 2008, I.K. told her that Manweller made advances toward her, but she liked him and would still meet him for drinks.

2. Manweller's Response

When interviewed, Manweller said that he and I.K. are still friends. He volunteered that he had communicated with her less than six months ago. When asked if it was during 2018, he said probably, maybe.

Manweller indicated that he had been drinking with I.I. and I.K., most of the time together. He said the two of them were close friends. Manweller acknowledged that he sometimes paid for

their drinks. As to whether I.K. was taking his classes during times when they had drinks, Manweller said that I.K. had been a triple major, and he thought she was pretty much finished with Political Science by then.

When asked if he had touched I.K. as she had claimed (i.e., her thigh, hair, shoulder, waist), Manweller said he had no recollection of intentionally touching I.K. or I.I. When asked if he complimented I.K.'s body, Manweller said he did not remember that. In regard to whether he said he was attracted to women with I.K.'s hair color, Manweller said he did not remember that statement.

This investigator asked if he talked to I.K. and I.I. about sex and read aloud the specific claims. Manweller stated that he recalled I.I. and I.K. joining him from time to time, but he did not remember specific conversations they had. He noted that it was a pretty long time ago.

When asked when he and I.K. had most recently communicated, Manweller looked at his phone and said there were texts from February 5 and February 28, 2018. He mentioned communication about I.K.'s new job. Manweller volunteered that I.K. had business from the Legislature from time to time, her politics were not on the same side as his, and they got a drink from time to time.

This investigator showed Manweller a photo of a text sent on Thursday, May 10, 2018 saying: "We ever going to get a drink again?" I.K. said she had received it from Manweller. He reviewed it and acknowledged that it was accurate.

K. Interviewee L (I.L.)

I.L. is the complaining party from the 2012 investigation of Manweller. On December 18, 2017, I.L.'s mother, W.10., contacted the University and relayed that she was very upset to read about her daughter in the Seattle Times. She stated that her daughter's experience with Manweller was degrading and traumatizing. W.10. asked that an investigator contact her and I.L.

1. Background

An independent investigator investigated I.L.'s concerns about Manweller in 2012. At that time, neither the investigator nor the University reached a determination of the merits of I.L.'s allegations.

The 2012 investigation report detailed evidence supporting I.L.'s claims, explained the reasons why the investigator questioned Manweller's credibility, and did not discuss any information that supported Manweller's denials. The investigator stated that, based on the documents reviewed and interviews conducted, "evidence exists to suggest Dr. Manweller engaged in conduct with or toward [I.L.]" in violation of the University's sexual harassment policy.

After the investigation report was issued, an October 8, 2012 memo to Manweller from then College of the Sciences Dean Kirk Johnson informed him that the University was not pursuing any discipline against him "as a result of the Report because of concerns due to the time interval between the events and this Report." Johnson did not state a determination of the merits of I.L.'s

allegations. At the same time, the memo included language suggesting that Johnson had not concluded that the allegations lacked merit. For example, Johnson stated:

I want to make it clear that *I have serious concerns about the behaviors described in the Report*. I hope that you will take this letter seriously. (emphasis added)

Also:

I am certain that you can correct these behaviors, if they occurred, and provide our students with the quality education they expect from Central Washington University. (emphasis added)

Consistent with Johnson not reaching a determination of the merits, in a declaration filed with the Kittitas County Superior Court dated October 25, 2012, the University's then Chief of Staff, Sherer Holter, made the following statement: "After reviewing the October 1 'Report of Investigation,' CWU did not make a determination that the allegations against Professor Manweller were substantiated and no disciplinary action was initiated against him."

Later, in October 2014, Manweller and the University executed a "Settlement and Release Agreement." While the precise scope of what was settled was not detailed with specificity (i.e., "certain disputed issues as between the parties relating to reported student concerns . . ."), nothing in the document mentioned I.L. or precluded the consideration of her information in evaluating subsequent claims of similar behavior involving Manweller.

This investigator was retained by the University to conduct a thorough fact finding. The allegations made by I.L. appeared to have various similarities to claims made by other female students and former students. Evidence of a potential pattern of conduct may be substantially relevant to the issues under investigation. Accordingly, it was appropriate to investigate the possible existence of a pattern, what the similarities may be, and whether or not the information makes the other claims more likely.²²

2. Issues Raised

I.L. was contacted and interviewed for the current investigation.²³ I.L. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including but not limited to compliments about her appearance, looking at her body, unwanted touching and kissing, and proposing sex in exchange for an educational benefit. She asserted the following:

²² The choice to include and analyze I.L.'s information was based on the independent judgment of this investigator and was not directed by the University. Any decision that may be made by the University regarding whether to consider or utilize investigation information related to I.L. subsequent to this investigation would fall within its sole discretion.

²³ Although I.L. stated that the 2012 investigation report was "pretty spot on," this investigator sought to gather information independently to the extent feasible.

- During the summer of 2006, I.L. took a class from Manweller called Politics and Film. At that time she was also enrolled in an individual study with him that he had proposed.
- Manweller was flirty toward I.L. in his tone of voice, leering eyes, and a gross grin that was kind of a leering look. She observed this in the two week period before she went to his office to meet with him about the individual study.
- Prior to the day she went to his office, Manweller showed *Thelma and Louise* in the film class. I.L. was standing in the back of the class because she had a sore neck. She was wearing a knee length skirt. While she was standing, Manweller had a leering look on his face and was looking her up and down.
- I.L. thinks it was toward the end of the film class when Manweller called her into his office to talk about the individual study. It was July or later.
- After she arrived, Manweller closed the office door and moved his chair so that he was sitting pretty close to her. He told her the sexual energy between the two of them was undeniable. He talked about the skirt she had worn in class and how she looked in it. He said "let's be adults about this" and "we can be discreet." He called her boyfriend a boy. He told her: "You don't want to write the paper and I don't want to read it." He made what she understood to be a reference to oral sex: he said they could go to a hotel and "discuss it orally."
- He then touched I.L., putting his fingertips right above her knee with his palm down. The touch felt sexual. He leaned in and kissed her on the mouth. I.L. was surprised and pulled back. She stammered something about her boyfriend and left.
- I.L. was in shock, upset, and disturbed, particularly about the communication about oral sex in the hotel and not having to do the paper.
- I.L. had concerns about retaliation. At the time she went to Manweller's office, she and her boyfriend had already asked Manweller for letters of recommendation for law school and were counting on him. She felt Manweller was trying to use the letters of recommendation for herself and her boyfriend as leverage, and she believes that this was why Manweller felt comfortable propositioning her. She feared that he would not do the letters for her or her boyfriend or give her a bad grade.
- Not long after the office incident, Manweller came into her workplace, a deli. He apparently knew she worked there, but I.L. did not know how he knew, because she did not tell him. When she saw him, she hid in the kitchen. Then the manager told her that someone was asking for her. Manweller told I.L. that her boyfriend had come by asking about his letter of recommendation. He said something about being really busy but would find time to do the letter. She does not remember if he mentioned her letter also, although she is inclined to say he did. Manweller was not being friendly like he had been before. He left without ordering anything. I.L. found it pretty bold that he just came in to discuss this. I.L. felt like Manweller was trying to hold the letter over her head and felt really rattled.

- I.L. does not remember submitting a paper for the individual study, although she received credit for it. (The 2012 investigation report stated that “according to [I.L.], she did not submit a written paper, per course requirement.”)
- Manweller did write letters of recommendation for I.L. and her boyfriend.
- Before the office incident, I.L. had wanted to take another class taught by Manweller. She did not, because she felt she had to avoid him. Had the office incident not occurred, she probably would have taken more classes from Manweller.
- I.L. met with W.8., the Political Science Department Chair, about Manweller. This was during the summer or in the early fall; it was not long after the office incident. I.L. felt W.8. was visibly very uncomfortable, and he did not encourage her to come forward. While he was not trying to get her out of his office, she felt he was not offering support. She thinks he encouraged her to go to Student Services.
- I.L. does not remember who else she met with, but she had another meeting at the University with a lady and a girl. Although they gave her a form, she did not feel that they gave her support to make a complaint.
- A couple of years after the office incident, Manweller called her mother’s phone looking for I.L., although I.L. had not given him her mother’s number.

3. University Records

A copy of I.L.’s individual study form was gathered in the 2012 investigation and reviewed again for the current investigation. It shows that I.L. was approved (by Manweller and the Political Science Department Chair, W.8.) for a one unit individual study under POSC 496 during the summer quarter of 2006. There are two options: a box for “Graded” and a box for “S/U.” The graded box is checked. The form also detailed the topic of her study.

A copy of the grade change form for I.L.’s individual study also was reviewed. The date on the form is September 13, 2006. The form seeks a grade change from I (Incomplete) to S. The S is inconsistent with the individual study form, which indicated that the course would be graded. For “Justification of Grade Change,” the handwritten text said “Ind study class needed more time to finish research project.” It is signed by Manweller and W.8. A Registrar Services “Received” stamp is dated September 19, 2006.

4. Witness 8 (W.8.)

W.8. was the Political Science Department Chair in 2006. When interviewed for this investigation, W.8. said that early in the fall quarter of 2006, he met with I.L. when she raised her concerns about Manweller. He explained that he did not really know her, and she had not been in any of his classes. W.8. reported that I.L. told him about the independent study and Manweller saying: “You don’t want to write it and I don’t want to read it.” He said she also described Manweller telling her that they should get a hotel room. W.8. stated that I.L. seemed

uncomfortable. W.8. said that while he is not trying to denigrate I.L.'s credibility, to the best of his knowledge she did not tell him then that Manweller had touched her knee or kissed her.

W.8. stated that his impression was that I.L. was intimidated and worried about a letter of recommendation from Manweller. He said she wanted to minimize contact with Manweller, so she transferred to be W.8.'s advisee. According to W.8., I.L. made clear that she did not want to report the situation and wanted it kept in confidence. W.8. said he hoped that she would come forward on the record later, but in the meantime he wanted to make sure she felt like she could get through the program. W.8. indicated that he did not have reason to think that I.L. made the story up; he didn't know her and had no way to judge her.

W.8. said that in regard to when Manweller turned in the grade change form for W.8. to sign in his role as Chair, W.8. does not remember if he knew at that time that I.L. was the student. He said he does not recall the order and timeline.

5. Witness 10 (W.10.)

W.10. is I.L.'s mother. When interviewed for this investigation, W.10. reported that a couple of years after I.L. left CWU, Manweller telephoned W.10. at her home. She said he told her he was looking for I.L. and said something like: "I want to get a hold of her." W.10. stated that she thinks she said: "I'll let her know," but she did not give Manweller a phone number or other contact information to reach I.L. W.10. stated that she did not have the same last name as I.L. at that time, and the number he phoned W.10. at was a landline. W.10. said she had that same phone number for something like 25 years and thought it would have been listed as the emergency contact number for I.L. at CWU. According to W.10., after getting the call she told I.L. that Manweller called looking for her, and I.L. said: "That's weird."

6. Witness 11 (W.11.)

W.11. is I.L.'s sister. W.11. informed this investigator that I.L. told her about her experience with the professor either the day it occurred or the day after. She said I.L. seemed alarmed and disturbed. W.11. stated that I.L. told her that she went to the professor's office, and he suggested that I.L. did not need to worry about doing the assignment. She recalled that I.L. told her that the professor said they could work out another arrangement other than doing the assignment, implying something sexual.

According to W.11., I.L. also told her that the professor had said he had noticed her in class and said they would have good chemistry or something like this – W.11. does not remember the words. W.11. remembered that I.L. said that the professor leaned into her. W.11. said she does not think that he touched her private areas, and she does not remember whether I.L. said he kissed her. W.11. described I.L. as not feeling flattered at all, and it was clear I.L. was not going back to his office.

7. Witness 12 (W.12.)

W.12. is a former boyfriend of I.L.²⁴ When interviewed for this investigation, he said that he and I.L. first met when I.L. was in her late teens. W.12. said he remembered that I.L. was really upset about her experience with the professor in his office and raised it with W.12. right away. He reported that I.L. told him that the professor made sexual advances toward her, and she was very upset about it. W.12. said he doesn't remember all of the details of the incident, but it was not appropriate. He emphasized that what I.L. shared with him about her experience with the professor upset him a lot, and he is very happy it is being looked into now.

8. Witness 13 (W.13.)

W.13. stated that she attended CWU with I.L., and they were good friends. W.13. reported that I.L. told her about her experience with the Political Science professor in his office at the time it happened. W.13. said that I.L. told her that the professor had been touching her leg/knee and was too close. W.13. said she kind of remembers an independent study. She said does not recall more details, other than the professor suggesting they spend time together. W.13. stated that I.L. was very bothered and was asking W.13. if she thought it was weird and creepy. She said she remembered that I.L. felt conflicted about reporting, as she wanted a good grade and didn't want to be the only one complaining. However, W.13. stated that she is pretty sure that I.L. did complain.

9. Manweller's Response

When interviewed for this investigation, Manweller declined to answer questions about I.L.'s allegations. He stated that there was no disciplinary action, and nothing had changed. His attorney contended that allegations that preceded the 2014 settlement agreement were covered by that agreement and are not an appropriate subject for questioning.

This investigator explained that she was particularly interested in (a) whether Manweller thought that the 2012 investigation report had quoted him accurately and (b) whether there was anything Manweller shared with the prior investigator that did not make it into the report. Manweller's attorney said if there was anything, they would supplement. As of the date of this investigation report, nothing along these lines was received.

In the absence of any information from Manweller about the substance of I.L.'s complaints, the investigation must rely on information apparently provided by Manweller for the prior investigation report. The information contained there was not extensive.

The investigator from the 2012 investigation stated that he found that Manweller's "credibility was not as strong as the other witnesses." He explained:

²⁴ W.12. is not the boyfriend she was seeing at the time of the encounter in Manweller's office. That former student was interviewed for the 2012 investigation but did not respond to inquiries for this investigation.

Dr. Manweller claims he does not know who [I.L.] is or whether she was a student at CWU. Dr. Manweller's knowledge of [I.L.] is questionable since: (1) [I.L.] took several classes with Dr. Manweller over the course of several years; (2) he approved an Individual Study Permit for [I.L.]; (3) he submitted a CHANGE OF GRADE Form for [I.L.]; (4) wrote her a letter of recommendation for law school; and (5) he remembered many details about [I.L.'s former boyfriend] and [a particular classmate and friend of I.L. and her former boyfriend],²⁵ but nothing about [I.L.]. He recalled [I.L.'s former boyfriend] having blonde hair, being a transfer student, and being too smart to be at CWU. Similarly, he recalled [I.L.'s friend's] hair style and that he liked to party in college. The letter of recommendation that Dr. Manweller wrote for [I.L.] states, in pertinent part:

[I.L.] has requested a letter of recommendation supporting her application to law school. I am happy to write on her behalf. I have known [I.L.] for the past three years. She was a student in many of my classes, including both my constitutional law classes.

The report also stated:

According to Dr. Manweller, he's being targeted because he's running for the 13th District Washington State House of Representatives. He believes [I.L.'s] Allegations and/or the rumors about his conduct towards female students stems from a misinterpretation. According to Dr. Manweller, rumors about him dating students began when he used to be married to a CWU student, who he met prior to his employment at CWU. Dr. Manweller stated that he was occasionally seen off campus holding her hand and kissing her in public.

10. Interviewee L – Additional Information

In light of the similarity between I.G.'s claims and I.L.'s,²⁶ following Manweller's interview, a copy of his drawing of his office floor plan was provided to I.L. to review. After reviewing it, I.L. stated that the furniture arrangement in the drawing is different than it was when she was in his office. I.L. shared the following:

- Manweller's desk was in front of the window. When he closed the office door, she sat in the chair that was to the right of the door. The door was to her left and behind her.
- Manweller was sitting in front of his desk in some kind of chair before he drew closer to I.L. Behind him was his desk, and behind the desk was a window.

²⁵ This friend of I.L. was interviewed for this investigation but indicated that he did not have relevant information to share, other than saying he had a recollection that I.L. indicated she was uncomfortable with Manweller but did not divulge any details to him.

²⁶ I.G. and I.L. denied knowing each other or recognizing each other's names.

- I.L. cannot remember if the chair Manweller sat in was a big chair or a normal chair. He may have been in a chair with wheels, because she remembers him making some kind of motion in the chair to get closer to her. But she cannot say for sure.
- She is not 100% certain if Manweller began the conversation sitting behind the desk or not. She does know that when he started talking about the sexual chemistry between them and the skirt she had worn to class, he was sitting in a chair that was in front of his desk.
- Manweller was sitting almost directly across from I.L., but they were slightly parallel in the room – like the door was on her left side and his right side.
- The chair he moved closer to I.L. was close enough to her chair that when he leaned forward he was able to touch her leg and kiss her.

L. Interviewee M (I.M.)

I.M. is a former CWU student who never took a class from Manweller. She contacted the University via email on December 7, 2017. In her message, she said:

After reading the more recent article(s) regarding Mathew Manweller, I think I should inform the staff who oversees issues of inappropriate boundaries and/or unprofessional behavior of professors employed by CWU, that I was indeed involved in a very inappropriate relationship with him while I attended school there.

She further stated:

[T]his has no political slant involved whatsoever. After reading about Manweller's attempts to misconstrue prior allegations, I thought perhaps my confession of my own experiences with him would supply evidence that this was not behavior toward his students only. His lack of professionalism was experienced by people who were merely in his daily routine. Quite frankly, I'm disgusted that he tried to call into question one girl's mental stability by commenting on her seeing a psychologist. What a low and incomprehensible standard he holds.

I.M.'s statement about Manweller trying to call into question one girl's mental stability referred to a sentence in a December 6, 2017 Seattle Times article by Mike Baker. In describing Manweller's response to the concerns of a student addressed in the 2013 investigation, the article said: "Manweller also questioned the woman's mental health — noting she had a counselor."

I.M. was frank in explaining that in 2006, her interactions with Manweller were not unwelcome. At the same time, she now views the situation as a highly unprofessional and inappropriate relationship with a student. She shared the following:

- I.M. met Manweller in the fall of 2006. He used to pass by a table in the Psychology building where she would sit, and he struck up a conversation with her. One day he invited her to go to a daytime Catholic Church fundraiser and she attended with him.

- Sometime in October 2006, I.M. asked Manweller to go have a drink before she left Ellensburg for the weekend. Manweller proposed that they go to his house to have a drink, which they did. They went in a bedroom and made out kind of intensely on the bed. Although she was willingly participating at the time, looking back, she feels frustrated that she was in this situation and regrets it.
- After the time at his house, she had some sporadic communication with Manweller, but it was not intentional for her and was nothing significant.
- Manweller made subsequent attempts to interact with her.
- On February 14, 2007, Manweller came to the office that a Psychology professor had lent to I.M. The office was in an area of the building where there were not many offices or people around. Although I.M. had told Manweller generally where the office was after he asked, she did not invite him. There was no reason for him to be in that area or on that floor of the building. The visit, which lasted five to ten minutes, had a lingering feeling to it and felt like he was testing the waters. I.M. didn't understand what he was doing there.
- In the summer of 2007, after I.M. graduated, he sent her an email telling her: "You know where my office is if you ever want to stop by . . ." ²⁷ She believed he knew she had graduated and found this a very sketchy thing to say. It seemed suggestive and inappropriate to her, given that her major interaction with him was being intimate at his house.
- In June 2008, Manweller called her and left her a message asking if she wanted to get together with him. She is pretty sure that Manweller left a message on her parents' home phone number, although she does not think she gave him that number. I.M. found the message very strange and felt dumbfounded, wondering why he was even calling her.

1. Witness 14 (W.14.)

W.14., I.M.'s sister, was interviewed for the investigation. She stated that many years ago – 2006-07, I.M. had told her that Manweller hit on her and was kind of a creepy guy. According to W.14., around that time she met Manweller through her work at a hotel. W.14. said that one day he was in W.14.'s office and saw a photo of her with I.M. He said: "You know [I.M.'s first name]?" W.14. said that he looked shocked, like he was going to have a stroke. To her, it seemed like he was afraid he was going to get caught. W.14. said she told Manweller that I.M. is her sister. She thinks he asked her where I.M. was or what she was doing.

2. Manweller's Response

Manweller described I.M. as a graduate student who was not in his department. According to University records, this statement was partly accurate. I.M. was not a graduate student in

²⁷ I.M. provided a copy of this email, which was shared with Manweller.

2006-07. University records reflected that I.M. graduated with an undergraduate degree in psychology in the winter quarter of 2007.

Manweller emphasized that his interactions with I.M. were always consensual. Manweller said he went on two dates with I.M., around 2006-07. One on occasion, they went to a church and had pie. He did not want to talk about the nature of their other date. Manweller stated that he was recently separated then, and it was not the University's business.

In regard to the visit to the professor's office, Manweller said he took exception to I.M.'s narrative and indicated he thought it was the office of a professor located elsewhere. At his interview, he was provided with copies of email messages related to the invitation to stop by his office in the summer of 2007 and the message in June 2008. He said he did not remember. He also said he did not remember W.14.

M. Interviewee N (I.N.)

I.N. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including interactions when she was a minor. She stated the following:

- I.N. participated in Running Start at CWU during her junior and senior years in high school.²⁸ She began Running Start in the fall of 2003 when she was a junior in high school. During her time in Running Start, I.N. told every one of her professors that she was in high school. She graduated from high school in 2005 and continued taking courses at CWU.
- I.N. took a course from Manweller in the spring of 2004, when she was 17 years old.
- While I.N. was a junior in high school, she and a female Running Start friend who was a high school senior had an encounter with Manweller at a coffee shop that made them feel pretty uncomfortable. He told them that a little windbreaker the friend was wearing reminded him of "Daisy Duke" and said he had had such a big crush on Daisy Duke.²⁹ I.N. did not think the jacket looked like Daisy Duke. Manweller was aware that they both were in high school.
- Before courses started in the fall of 2004 (I.N.'s senior year of high school), one Friday afternoon she went to Manweller's office to ask his opinion on what course to enroll in next. Manweller asked her what she was doing that weekend. He told her that his wife was out of town for the weekend and he would be alone. I.N. told him she was going to a movie with a friend. Manweller responded that if her friend could not come to the movie with her, he would "chaperone" her to the movie.

²⁸ Running Start is a program that allows eligible high school juniors and seniors to enroll in tuition-free college courses at CWU.

²⁹ Daisy Duke is a fictional character from the television series *The Dukes of Hazzard*, which aired from 1979 to the mid-1980s. The character is commonly associated with wearing revealing clothing.

- He then gave her his cell phone number on the back of a business card. She was 17, and she has absolutely no doubt that he knew she was in high school.
- It made I.N. feel terrible and made a strong impression on her. She has never forgotten any part of the experience and found Manweller to be a creep. But for the situation in his office, she would have majored in Political Science.
- In the fall of 2005, after I.N. had graduated from high school, I.N. was taking a morning class in Hertz Hall. Manweller noticed her and followed her into the classroom. He came in just to talk to her, not to other students or the professor. This occurred once or twice. She remembered one time very specifically. Manweller was standing at her desk, and she was sitting. He was saying things like “how are you,” “how was your summer.” He was really smiley and friendly. I.N. was not speaking and found the experience upsetting.

1. Witness 15 (W.15.)

W.15. and I.N. are friends. When interviewed for this investigation, W.15. said that in the fall of 2004, I.N. was still in high school (and Running Start) and 17 years old. W.15. had graduated and was in college. W.15. said she remembered that she came home from college for a particular weekend that fall. She said that when she got home, I.N. told her that earlier that day Manweller had asked her to go to a movie with him. W.15. reported that I.N. was super uncomfortable about what had happened. She said that she recalled going to the movie with I.N. that night, and identified the same movie I.N. had said: *Napoleon Dynamite*.³⁰

2. Witness 16 (W.16.)

W.16. is the friend I.N. said she was with when Manweller made the Daisy Duke comment. W.16. attended CWU for Running Start while she was in high school. The last year she was there was 2003-04. University records showed that she took one class from Manweller in 2004. When interviewed, W.16. said she is pretty sure that Manweller knew she was in high school.

W.16. indicated that she had had a negative interaction with Manweller that involved verbal communication and did not include touching. W.16. stated that she does not remember the details of what happened, although it probably occurred in his office. She said she avoided him after that. W.16. reported that she had told her friend I.N. that she was uncomfortable about Manweller. W.16. said that I.N. shared with her that she also had concerns, but W.16. did not have details.

3. Manweller’s Response

When interviewed, Manweller said he did not recognize I.N.’s name. He said: “Why would I offer to chaperone someone to the movies.” Manweller also stated that he did not remember W.16., although he would recognize the name if she is related to [a particular

³⁰ *Napoleon Dynamite* was released that year, 2004.

person with the same last name]. He said he did not remember talking to anyone about Daisy Duke.

N. Interviewee O (I.O.)

I.O. described unwelcome attention from Manweller, including complimenting her voice. She is a former CWU student who took a class from Manweller during winter quarter of 2005.³¹ On December 8, 2017, I.O. contacted the University to voice her concerns about Manweller, stating:

While taking his class he would often ask me to stop by his office after class, I went the first couple times but soon realized he wasn't interested in talking about his class subject, he wanted to just "talk" with me and often told me he liked my voice and would never forget a voice like mine.

I stopped going to his office when asked and never took a class from him again but I just want to make sure someone knows of his creepy behavior.

A copy of a December 8, 2017 Facebook post by I.O. directed to the University stated:

You are failing your students and not protecting their rights and safety. Do something about Matt Manweller, there is no reason he should still be a professor there. I wrote emails complaining about him as a student in 2006 and nothing was done and it appears nothing is still being done. CWU should be ashamed.

Another Facebook post by I.O. that is undated but understood to be within December 2017 said:

He's a creep. I had him as a professor and he repeatedly called me into his office to "talk" after the first couple times of visiting with him and being told he liked my voice and . . .³²

In a radio interview with Austin Jenkins on December 12, 2017, I.O. told him:

After sitting there in [Manweller's] office for a little while, it became apparent that he didn't have any interest in talking to me about the class. He just wanted to talk to me about me or about whatever.

He told me that he liked my voice and that he'd never forget a voice like mine and I think that was a moment of, "OK, I probably shouldn't be in this office anymore."

³¹ I.O. initially identified the year as 2005 and later changed to 2004. University records confirmed that I.O. took Manweller's class in 2005.

³² The content appeared to be longer but the photo provided for this investigation cut the content off at "and."

And I wish I would have [complained to the University] and it's one of the reasons that I'm saying something now.³³

When interviewed for this investigation, I.O. was asked what she specifically remembered. She shared the following:

- During the quarter she took his class, Manweller told I.O. to stop by his office. She thought the request was related to the class.
- When I.O. went to his office, she found Manweller essentially just asking her questions about herself and not talking about the class. She immediately felt uncomfortable.
- Manweller told I.O. that he liked her voice and said something like: "You have a very distinct voice. I'll never forget a voice like that." He sounded intrigued.
- What Manweller told I.O. made her feel uncomfortable. No one else has ever told her she has a voice they would never forget. She found his behavior creepy and never took a class from him again.
- I.O. did not make a formal complaint or raise concerns through formal channels. She recalls sending an email about her concerns to someone at the University, although she does not remember who it was. It may have been the head of the Department. I.O. does not remember someone responding. She does not have a specific recollection regarding the timing.

1. Manweller's Response

Manweller stated that he did remember I.O. but not the conversation. He said she works at a "paint store," and her parents are highly involved in the Democratic Party. Manweller stated that he had no recollection of saying that I.O. has a distinctive voice.

O. Interviewee P (I.P.)

I.P. described unwelcome attention, including inappropriate comments and looking at her body. She asserted the following:

- I.P. attended CWU from 2008-12. She majored in Political Science.
- I.P. took more than one class from Manweller and also babysat for him. When his wife was out of town, he would bring his baby to campus, and I.P. would babysit in his office.

³³ The radio interview can be found at <http://nwnewsnetwork.org/post/manweller-put-paid-leave-cwu-former-student-describes-unwanted-attention>.

- During the summer quarter in 2009, I.P. took a class from Manweller about constitutional law in times of war.³⁴ One day I.P. wore a cami top to class that she thought was appropriate, as it didn't show much. With her body type, even if she wears a top with a higher neckline, she may still show a little cleavage. I.P. usually sat in the first two rows in most of her classes. Manweller could see what she was wearing from where he was in the room.
- After the class, Manweller sent I.P. a text telling her she should not wear that top because it was distracting him. Although he sort of presented it like a joke, I.P. found the text inappropriate, felt a little weirded out, and did not respond to it.
- During a later quarter, there was an occasion when she had been babysitting in Manweller's office and was getting ready to leave. They were having some light conversation. Manweller said: "At this rate, I'm going to need to find another job."³⁵ I.P. joked that Arby's was hiring. Manweller then said: "You better close the door so no one can hear you scream when I spank you." I.P. laughed it off, said goodbye, and left. She felt it was inappropriate, and it made her feel uncomfortable.
- I.P. does not remember W.22., although she did take International Politics with Professor Otopalik. [University records reflect that W.22. and I.P. both took the course from Otopalik in the winter of 2012.] This investigator shared with I.P. the following information provided by W.22.:

There was a particular day when W.22. and I.P. were waiting to go into the classroom, and I.P. saw an interaction between Manweller and W.22. W.22.'s midriff had been showing a tiny bit. W.22. and I.P. both noticed Manweller looking at W.22.'s body a little bit. Afterward, I.P. told W.22. to be careful with Manweller.

- I.P. said it could have happened, but she does not recall it at all.

1. Manweller's Response

The information from I.P. was obtained following Manweller's interview for this investigation. He was provided with the relevant information from I.P. but did not offer a response prior to the date of this investigation report.

³⁴ When interviewed, I.P. did not recall which summer it was. According to University records, the course would have been POSC 470 - Contemporary Issues in International Relations in the summer of 2009.

³⁵ When asked what she thought he meant by this, I.P. said that they were talking about working and getting paid. She was looking for a part time job, and they had talked about Manweller teaching only one or two classes that quarter. She said she could not recall if he was referring to not getting paid enough.

2. Interviewee P – Additional Information

On June 27, 2018, I.P. shared with this investigator screenshots of Facebook messages Manweller sent her on June 20, 2018. She said that she had commented on a political post that Manweller made,³⁶ and then he messaged her. He included a screen shot of this investigator's documentation of her interview (in which she was referred to as I.P.) that was shared with him as well as the following communications:

- “Are you seriously posting on my Facebook page after what you just did to my family?”
- “Just got the interview summary”
- “You did talk to this [investigator] correct?”
- “You did say these things about me? Correct?”
- “Read the summary I attached? Is that an accurate representation of what you told her?”
- “Well?!”

I.P. acknowledged to him that she had been contacted by an investigator.

Copies of these Facebook messages were sent by this investigator to Manweller and his representatives on June 28, 2018. He did not provide a response.

P. Other Witness Information

1. Witness 17 (W.17.)

W.17. is male and a former CWU student. He contacted the University on December 12, 2017. At that time, he stated that he had read the Seattle Times report and wanted the University to know that he witnessed Manweller's “bad behavior” in class. W.17. reported that Manweller often made comments about how women looked in class.

University records reflected that W.17. took one of Manweller's classes in the spring of 2005. When interviewed for this investigation, he said that every day that W.17. was in the class, Manweller would segue in some comment on a female's appearance. He said Manweller did not compliment males this way. W.17. further stated that he watched Manweller ask female students to go out to a bar – just females, no males. According to W.17, Manweller would say “we should go have drinks” or invite them to his house. W.17. said that he also recalled that there was talk outside the classroom that Manweller's class was not the best for female students to take because of the unwanted attention.

In his interview, Manweller was asked if he had a response regarding W.17. He said no.

³⁶ I.P. said she deleted the comment.

2. Witness 18 (W.18.)

W.18. is a former CWU student. She took multiple classes from Manweller, including the same class in which W.17. was enrolled in the spring of 2005. In her interview, W.18. stated that it was not unusual to see Manweller out at The Tav with female students. She said that flirting was the way he acted. W.18. indicated that she perceived sort of an open invitation for females to flirt with him (although she did not herself). She explained that she felt that Manweller was interested in relationships with girls who were flirty and laughing at his jokes – and she certainly saw that – and not engaging more intellectually. According to W.18., there seemed to be knowledge that if you'd flirt with him, you could do well in his class. However, she said she does not know where that knowledge came from.

When asked about the information from W.18., Manweller asserted that W.18. had been best friends with I.K. When asked if he had any comments, he said no.

3. Witness 19 (W.19.)

W.19. is a former CWU student. She did not take a class from Manweller. When interviewed for this investigation, W.19. said she remembered being at the Starlight with a friend [the complaining party from the 2013 investigation³⁷] and Manweller in 2006. She reported that they were in a booth, and he paid for their drinks. W.19 said that Manweller was acting flirty and acting like he was trying to impress them. She went on to say that Manweller was talking about sex, although W.19. no longer remembers the details. She said that he was asking personal questions and was mainly interested in her friend, who did not seem to welcome the attention and seemed uncomfortable. W.19. stated that Manweller did most of the talking, and her friend did not talk much. In regard to whether Manweller talked to them about a “threesome” [as reported in the 2013 investigation report], W.19. said it sounded familiar, but she no longer has a specific recollection. She stated that she would not have agreed to a threesome with him. W.19. said that afterward, her friend was really bothered. She said her friend thought that Manweller was checking her out. She said her friend also told W.19. that she felt uncomfortable going to his class and indicated that he made her uneasy. W.19. said she had no reason to doubt anything her friend said and never found her to be untruthful.

Manweller declined to comment on the information from W.19.

4. Witness 20 (W.20.)

On December 8, 2017, W.20. emailed an individual in the Provost's office to share her concerns about Manweller, stating that she felt the need to reach out after all of the news reports. W.20. explained that she is the former secretary at the Political Science Department, where she worked from December 2014 until September 2017. She supervised the student employees, all of whom were female. In her email, W.20. shared some concerns about Manweller, which she also discussed in her interview for this investigation.

³⁷ W.19.'s friend from the 2013 investigation did not respond to this investigator's attempts to reach her.

W.20. stated that she learned of Manweller's reputation in regard to female students after she started her position. W.20. said she was told it was public record, and she looked it up. W.20. explained that she felt that she needed to tell the (all female) student employees about the allegations and instruct them not to go into Manweller's office alone. She said she asked them to please let her know if they felt uncomfortable. According to W.20., no one asked her to take this approach with the students; she just did it when she found out about him. She said she did not follow this protocol with any other faculty in the Political Science Department.

W.20 observed that Manweller took a keen interest in one of the female student employees, W.21., who looked like she was 15 years old. W.21. worked there from 2016 until her graduation in 2017. W.20. said that Manweller would pay attention to what this student wore and her hair and compliment her appearance. W.20. described Manweller as having a radiant smile when he would see her and said he would try to engage her in conversations about her interests. W.20. said she found his behavior to be creepy. Because of her concerns, W.20. said she tried very hard to be present in any interaction Manweller and the female student employee might have. She added that Manweller did not treat W.20. or the other female student employees this way.

When interviewed, Manweller acknowledged that he knows W.20. from when she was the Department secretary. He stated that her information was in some ways enlightening: she was looking for something wrong because she was told something wrong. He indicated that W.20. had been instructed; when asked by whom, he indicated that he did not know.

W.21., the female student W.20. said Manweller took a keen interest in, was interviewed for this investigation. W.21. stated that she thought Manweller was really nice and did not feel uncomfortable around him.

V. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The analysis and findings are based on a preponderance of the evidence, commonly defined as "more likely than not." The findings in this report are factual findings and do not reach questions of whether the alleged misconduct constituted a violation of applicable laws or policies.

A. Credibility Assessments

Because the contentions of Manweller and the other parties differed substantially, a detailed credibility analysis was necessary. The factors relied upon in finding I.A. – I.P. more credible than Manweller are explained below.³⁸ All of these factors were thoroughly considered in reaching the factual findings set forth in Section V.B.

³⁸ This investigator generally does not rely on visual demeanor indicators (facial expression, body language, etc.) in making credibility assessments. Social science research reflects that most people do little better than chance in determining whether someone is untruthful by looking at demeanor. Consistent with this research, in this investigator's investigation experience over two decades and more than 200 investigations, visual demeanor indicators have not been shown to reliably establish proof of truthfulness or untruthfulness.

1. Credibility of Manweller

a. Manner of Responding to Questions

While Manweller did deny some of the behavior attributed to him, in many situations his responses fell short of specifically denying the conduct. In response to various questions, Manweller made statements such as “I don’t think so” or “I don’t think that happened.” For a person who is facing allegations of inappropriate behavior by fifteen female students and former students (plus various witnesses), one might reasonably expect more definitive answers. Notably, Manweller received detailed material about the allegations and supporting information a week prior to his interview, so none of the questions should have caught him by surprise.

In some instances, Manweller offered fairly emphatic denials, such as “no” and “absolutely not.” Choosing to say “I don’t think so” or “I don’t think that happened” when “no” or “absolutely not” were unambiguous options available to him was problematic for his credibility.

Additionally, in response to a large number of questions, Manweller said that he did not remember. Since memories can fade with the passage of time, it seems likely that for at least a few of these questions Manweller may have genuinely not remembered. However, because he responded that he did not remember to so many questions, at times this investigator asked him if it was *possible* that he had engaged in the conduct in question. For the initial portion of his interview, Manweller did give some responses to questions about whether the action at issue was possible.

During Manweller’s questioning about the allegations involving I.B., Manweller’s attorney objected to questions about whether certain things that Manweller said he could not remember were possible. Manweller’s attorney maintained that such questions required speculation, and he asserted that such questions are unfair because “everything is possible.” This investigator did not find this contention persuasive. Not everything is possible. If Manweller was being asked about behavior he had never engaged in with a female student or former student and never would engage in with a female student or former student, it would be reasonable to expect him to be able to answer that the allegation was not possible.

In an effort to avoid the distraction of the disagreement around this issue during the remainder of the interview, this investigator asked that for subsequent areas of questioning, Manweller tell her if any of the alleged conduct was possible or not possible. He agreed but did not address this subject for the rest of the interview. Declining to exclude the possibility that he engaged in certain behavior suggested that he believes that he may have engaged in the conduct.

b. Motive to Misrepresent

As the responding party in the investigation, Manweller had a motive to misrepresent. The allegations against him are of a serious nature, and he previously had been disciplined for inappropriate interactions with female University students.

c. Plausibility

During his interview, Manweller made some implausible assertions that were not credible, particularly in regard to I.D. and I.E. These are addressed in Section V.B. below.

d. Failing to Respect the Integrity of the Investigation

Some of Manweller's conduct in the course of the investigation failed to respect the integrity of the investigation and undermined his credibility as a result.

During the investigation, Manweller was asked on multiple occasions to provide contact information for W.22., including in his interview on June 5, 2018 and in an email message on June 7, 2018. Based on the representations Manweller had made about W.22. to I.A., W.22. had the potential to be an important fact witness. However, Manweller never provided W.22.'s contact information. Evidence gathered in the investigation reflected that subsequent to being asked to provide that contact information, Manweller communicated with W.22. to tell her the information she should speak to and subsequently made repeated attempts to reach her again on multiple dates – without ever providing this investigator the requested contact information for W.22.

Additionally, the communications Manweller sent I.P. on June 20, 2018 were not consistent with respecting the integrity of the investigation. He sent her a screenshot of the summary of I.P.'s interview as well as the following messages:

- “Are you seriously posting on my Facebook page after what you just-did to my family?”
- “Just got the interview summary”
- “You did talk to this [investigator] correct?”
- “You did say these things about me? Correct?”
- “Read the summary I attached? Is that an accurate representation of what you told her?”
- “Well?!”

2. Credibility of I.A. – I.P.

a. Corroboration

Corroboration was a significant factor in finding I.A. – I.P. more credible than Manweller. Corroborating information included but was not limited to witnesses who observed inappropriate conduct directly, witnesses who heard contemporaneous accounts of the complained of conduct, University records, video, and text messages.³⁹

³⁹ The corroborating evidence is addressed in detail in the individual findings in Section V.B.

b. Motive to Misrepresent

The investigation did not identify a motive for I.A. – I.P. to fabricate their accounts. There did not appear to be any potential benefit to any of them for bringing a false complaint. Only two are still CWU students, and neither of them had any open issue with Manweller (e.g., a dispute over a grade).

Among I.A. – I.P., only four of the interviewees initiated contact with the University regarding their concerns about Manweller. This investigator initiated contact with the other eleven female students and former students. If they possessed some motive to fabricate a complaint, it stands to reason that they most likely would have taken some action to bring the issues forward rather than passively waiting to see if they might be contacted.

At the same point in the interview when this investigator asked that Manweller tell her if any of the alleged conduct was possible or not possible, this investigator also asked that Manweller let her know if there was any reason a particular person would say something that was not true. He agreed, but did not identify any motive for fabrication by any individual during the rest of the interview. Neither did he offer information identifying such motives subsequent to his interview.

c. Plausibility

The interviewees' accounts of their experiences with Manweller were thorough and detailed, and they were not cookie cutter replicas of each other. They provided an extensive amount of specific detail that could be – and in large part was – verified. The investigation did not reveal evidence of hyperbole or attempts to characterize information in a dramatic way that was not warranted by the facts.

It is not likely that I.A. – I.P. – and their witnesses – would recall and convey such specific and verifiable information if the claims were false. This would be especially true for the eleven women with whom contact was initiated by the investigator. In the absence of ample advance notice, it is not plausible that detailed allegations of this nature could be fabricated on the spot.

Moreover, the totality of the circumstances reflected numerous similar behaviors alleged by I.A. – I.P. By illustration, the behaviors included looking at the bodies of female students and former students, physical touching, offers of educational benefit in exchange for sex, unwelcome communications with sexual/romantic overtones, compliments based on physical characteristics, asking inappropriate personal questions, and other unwelcome or inappropriate attention. These similarities, and the evidence supporting each of the allegations, enhanced the plausibility and credibility of the claims overall.

d. Lack of Evidence of Collusion

The investigation failed to identify a basis to believe that I.A. – I.P. were colluding in bringing forth similar allegations. If their allegations were fabricated, it would necessitate substantial coordination between I.A. – I.P., as well as with witnesses. The information gathered failed to

show that these female students and former students possessed – and acted on – some common motive or plan to bring false claims.

3. Credibility of Witnesses

Many – but not all – of the witnesses identified as W.1.-W.26. were suggested for interviews by I.A. – I.P., Manweller, or another of the witnesses. A good number were identified as a friend, family member, or person who could provide support for certain information.

The credibility of each witness was considered, particularly in regard to the questions of bias and motive. While some may have had a potential bias based on a relationship (e.g., friendship), the investigation did not reveal information establishing that someone was offering false or incomplete information as a result of such bias. This was the case for witnesses offered by Manweller, I.A. – I.P., and others. Neither did the investigation uncover evidence reflecting that a witness had a concrete, identifiable motive to fabricate information and actually did so.

B. Summary of Findings

A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that Manweller engaged in treatment of female students and former students that was inappropriate, unprofessional, and had gender-based and/or sexual overtones. In addition to the credibility assessments discussed above, the factors and considerations that follow were key to reaching this finding.

The evidence gathered in this investigation presented the following question:

What are the chances that a blameless person would be repeatedly accused of such similar, inappropriate conduct?

The information gathered in the investigation reflected substantial similarities and overlap among the experiences of I.A. – I.P. and W.22. The evidence established the following similar conduct:

1. Looking at the bodies of female students and former students

Nine women: I.A., I.B., I.D., I.E., I.F., I.K., I.L, I.P., W.22.

2. Physical touching

Six women: I.D., I.G., I.H., I.I., I.K., I.L.

3. Communications with sexual or romantic overtones

Six women: I.G., I.H., I.I., I.K., I.L., I.P.

4. Offering an educational benefit in exchange for sex

Two women: I.G., I.L.

5. Compliments based on physical characteristics

Seven women: I.A., I.D., I.H., I.K., I.L., I.O., I.P.

6. Asking inappropriate personal questions

Five women: I.A., I.G., I.H., I.I., I.K.

7. Attempting further communication following unambiguous indications of unwelcomeness

Three women: I.G., I.H., I.L.

8. Acting inappropriately in his office

Seven women: I.G., I.H., I.I., I.L., I.N., I.O., I.P.

9. Setting up situations that made it difficult to end the encounter

Four women: I.A., I.C., I.D., I.H.

10. Behavior that negatively impacted the student's educational experience in some way

Five women: I.B., I.C., I.G., I.L., I.N.

11. Actions that made third party observers uncomfortable

Three men and four women: W.2., W.5., W.17., W.18., W.19., W.20., W.23.

12. Conduct that was not unwelcome at the time but now is perceived as inappropriate and unprofessional

Three women: I.I., I.K., I.M.

13. Other unwelcome or inappropriate attention

Nine women: I.A., I.C., I.D., I.E., I.F., I.H., I.I., I.N., I.O.

Manweller failed to offer compelling information to counter the women's claims and the supporting evidence, and the information he did provide was minimal. He never explained a reason that he would find himself repeatedly accused of such similar, inappropriate conduct if it did not occur. He did not offer any motive for why these women would make such allegations if they were not true. He did not clearly deny – or exclude the possibility that he could have engaged in – much of the conduct.

Moreover, the evidence reflected that the behavior in question had sexual overtones and/or was gender-based. None of I.A. – I.P. are male. And no one interviewed for the investigation – including Manweller himself – claimed that Manweller engaged in any of the behaviors with male students or male former students.

To the extent that the attention was unwelcome, it placed the onus on the women to either acquiesce to the conduct or take responsibility for stopping it – for example, by communicating to him that it was unwelcome, avoiding him, or making a complaint. The discomfort of the situation and concerns about the repercussions of objecting to the behavior are heightened in circumstances such as these where a power differential is present.

C. Findings on Specific Allegations

Findings for individuals’ allegations are detailed below. The content in the above sections on the credibility assessments and summary of findings should be understood to broadly apply to the individual findings that follow; not all of the points are reiterated for each individual determination.

1. Finding: Interviewee A

The evidence supported a finding that it was more likely than not that the alleged conduct by Manweller occurred, essentially as reported by I.A. Briefly, this included the following behavior during the 2017 legislative session:

- **Showing I.A. more personal attention than other legislators did**
 - Manweller would seek her out to chat or say hi after committee meetings. He would also stop and say hi to her when she would see him on the Capitol Campus, even if he was talking with another legislator.
 - In the committee meetings, there were several occasions when I.A. looked up from taking notes to find Manweller looking right at her. I.A. did not experience this with other committee members.
 - Manweller initiated the job/career talk with her and asked her for her resume three times. When she finally sent it to him, he said to let him know if she wanted to meet and discuss what she wanted to do.
 - Manweller sent her text messages. Some were about job interests, but not all of them. For example, one said: “Have a good weekend and Happy Easter [emoji of a baby chick in an egg shell].”

- **Turning a meeting to talk about her career into a date**
 - One day in early April 2017, when I.A. was expecting to have a career discussion, Manweller took her to dinner at a restaurant without asking her beforehand.
 - Manweller was using a flirtatious tone and acting like someone on a date. He ordered I.A. a vodka tonic after she said she did not want a drink and poked fun at her for not wanting to have a drink.
 - While the purpose of the meeting was to discuss her career, Manweller largely talked about other things, and I.A. struggled to turn the talk to something productive.

- When they were getting up to leave, Manweller grabbed I.A.'s jacket before she could, and he put it on her. Then he opened the restaurant door for her. He also opened the car door for her.
- Manweller texted I.A. that same night, saying: "Hey. Just checking to make sure you made it home safe. You did have a whole vodka tonic and all [smiley face emoji]."
- **Asking her personal questions.** At the restaurant, Manweller asked I.A. a variety of personal questions, including wanting to know if I.A. lived alone and asking if she had been dating in Olympia. In regard to her prior marriage, Manweller asked: "Did you try to have kids and couldn't?"
- **Complimenting her appearance.** During the dinner, Manweller told the server "It's up to this beautiful woman to decide" whether they would have dessert.
- **Asking her to have dinner again**
 - Subsequent to the dinner at the restaurant and a couple of days before she finished her work at the Legislature, Manweller texted I.A.: "Hey there [smiley face emoji]. Do you want to grab dinner tonight??" The message did not mention another person or a business-related purpose for the dinner. She declined his offer, saying "I wasn't comfortable when our last meeting turned into dinner."
 - Manweller texted back: "Sorry for that." His message then asserted that he was having dinner with a person he named from a particular organization and wanted to invite I.A. along. He said: "Here is the job she has not posted but wanted me to give to you" and included a posting. I.A. did not think Manweller's asserted scenario was real and felt very angry.
- **Looking at her body.** At a video-recorded committee meeting during the 2017 legislative session, I.A. helped distribute binders to the members, who were seated on the dais. After the binders were distributed, Manweller made eye contact with I.A. just before she passed behind his seat on the dais. He waited for her to pass and then turned and looked her body down and up.

a. Manweller's Response

Manweller's responses to I.A.'s claims largely consisted of denials and saying that he did not remember. In regard to showing I.A. more personal attention than other legislators, Manweller denied seeking I.A. out to say hi or chat. He said that he saw her only in committee. When asked about I.A.'s claim that she would look up and see him looking at her in meetings, Manweller said that he looks around and they are two hour meetings; he said he guessed it was possible. Manweller denied asking for I.A.'s resume multiple times but did acknowledge asking for it. Manweller said that he did not remember if he offered to meet with I.A. He also said he did not remember how they exchanged cell phone numbers.

Manweller offered little to refute I.A.'s contention that he had turned a meeting into a date. While he did deny I.A.'s assertion that he asked the server to bring her an alcoholic drink after she said she did not want one, on other points, he was less clear. When this investigator asked Manweller about I.A.'s claim that he had been flirtatious and acting like he was on a date, he did

not deny it but contended that he did not know what that means. He said: “I just talk the way I talk.” When asked if he had poked fun at I.A., Manweller said that he did not remember. When asked if it was possible, he said “I tease people” and said again that he did not remember.

In regard to I.A.’s claims that Manweller asked her if she lived alone, asked if she was dating, and asked if she was unable to have kids, he said he did not remember. When asked if he told the server that he would let the “beautiful woman decide” on dessert, Manweller said he did not remember that. When asked if it was something he might say, he said he did not think so. Manweller was asked if he sent the text with the following content: “Hey. Just checking to make sure you made it home safe. You did have a whole vodka tonic and all [smiley face emoji].” He said yes, “that’s my personality.”

Manweller’s response to asking I.A. if she wanted to “grab dinner” via text message was essentially included within his follow up text when she declined. In his interview, when asked the reason he did not tell I.A. about the person he wanted to introduce her to in his initial message about grabbing dinner, Manweller said he did not remember.

While Manweller did not address the video at his interview – indicating he had not yet watched it – his attorney later answered for him via email and maintained it showed nothing inappropriate.

b. Evidence Supporting the Finding

The greater weight of evidence supported a finding that Manweller engaged in the conduct alleged by I.A.

When asked if he thought I.A. would say something that was not true, Manweller said he did not know her well enough. If any of what I.A. had alleged was untruthful, this would have been Manweller’s opportunity to say that she *had* said things that were not true. The fact that he did not seem to be telling.

W.1., I.A.’s sister, corroborated that I.A. gave her a contemporaneous account of her evening at the restaurant with Manweller. She confirmed that I.A. had called her the same night and told W.1.: “I think this guy took me on a date without me knowing it” and “I feel like something inappropriate just happened.” W.1. stated that I.A. described the experience as really weird, and told her how they were at the Capitol, then went to his car, and then went for drinks, where he had been asking her really personal questions.

Some of Manweller’s representations about the evening were difficult to reconcile with other information. First, Manweller did not offer a compelling professional reason to be having drinks and dinner at a nice restaurant with I.A., a young, female legislative assistant. When asked if the meeting’s purpose had been to talk about her career, Manweller said he didn’t think it was very defined. He further stated that he remembered that she had done outdoor work, which did not help for a political job. If the purpose of the meeting was not well defined, and he did not think she had an extensive background of experience that would make her well suited for a political job (and thus a person for whom his time would be well spent providing extensive career advice), there was not an obvious professional or business reason that warranted having dinner and drinks with her at a nice restaurant.

Second, while Manweller acknowledged that they had dinner and drinks at Dillinger's, he also tried to describe the time he spent with I.A. at the restaurant as pretty "perfunctual." He characterized it as a "brief conversation" and emphasized that he has thousands of fifteen minute conversations in the Legislature, most of which are not memorable. Yet dinner and drinks at a restaurant to which they drove together in his car shares little in common with a brief fifteen minute conversation. If all he wanted was to provide I.A. with career help in the form of a brief conversation, there were simple ways he could have done so that did not require dinner and drinks, such as a conversation over the phone. His attempt to describe their dinner as a brief conversation was not credible.

Third, when asked what he remembered of their conversation at dinner, Manweller asserted that the two of them were catching up since he hadn't seen her since 2008-09. However, when asked if he had gotten to know her as a student, Manweller said no and stated that she was only in his class ten times in his entire life. The need to catch up with a person he had never gotten to know was not apparent and seemed like an attempt to divert attention from I.A.'s claims about what he had said to her and asked her at the dinner.

Additionally, the evidence supported a finding that Manweller's behavior on the evening of the dinner was gender-based. If Manweller wanted to help I.A. with career advice, there were appropriate ways he could have done so that did not involve such things as:

- walking her to his car
- dinner at a nice restaurant
- questions about her dating life, whether she lived alone, and her ability to have children
- complimenting her physical attractiveness
- putting her jacket on her and
- sending her a text with a smiley face emoji checking to see if she made it home safe.

The investigation revealed no evidence, and neither did Manweller claim any existed, that when young men seek career advice he treats them in a similar manner.

Moreover, Manweller lacked corroboration for the key elements of his justification for asking I.A. via text if she wanted to grab dinner again. W.22. did not corroborate Manweller's story that she had wanted him to give the job posting to I.A. or that he asked her if he could invite I.A. to have dinner with them. While she acknowledged that she had drafted the job posting for a Facebook networking group, W.22. stated that she did not believe she ever told Manweller to send the staffer, I.A., the job posting and said she did not remember talking with Manweller about this specific girl, much less him inviting her to have dinner with them. She explained that she would have found that somewhat unusual, as she was not in charge of hiring for the position and was not a decision maker. W.22. emphasized that she knows that she didn't say to Manweller: "Hey do you know anyone for this job." She said it was not like she would go to him and ask him does he know someone for the position; it would have just been "this is happening." According to W.22., she had wanted to offer the job to her Facebook group for networking. Also, W.22. said that she did not have any concern about getting the position filled; it was filled within a day.

Furthermore, not answering questions about the video in his interview diminished Manweller's credibility. He did not provide an explanation for why he allegedly had not reviewed it prior to

his interview, despite having a link to the video and notice of the specific seconds to review for a full week. As someone placed on administrative leave for this investigation, there was no apparent reason to think he could not have found the time to review a few specific seconds of video in that time period – and he did not claim that this was the case. During the same time frame, he found time to do other preparation for his interview, as evidenced by information he and his attorney provided at his interview.⁴⁰ Having his attorney answer in his place on a later date did not bolster Manweller’s credibility.

A copy of the video of the committee meeting also corroborated I.A.’s account. The moment she referenced was consistent with her description. It is worthy of note that I.A. made no attempt during the investigation to exaggerate the content or portray it as anything more than what it shows. The relevant portion reflects what I.A. described. After she passes behind him, Manweller’s head swings to look behind him to the left, with his focus right at the level where her rear end was. He knew she was passing behind him, and there was nothing else he could have reasonably expected to see in that spot other than her rear end. (Behind her was a blank wall.) Manweller’s visual focus can then be seen to travel from the area of her rear end up her body. Although the relevant segment of the video is brief, the spot to which Manweller directly aimed his view as she passed behind him and the trajectory of his line of sight reflected that he was looking at her body. There was not anything else in that space that he could have been looking at.

In addition, as with the others among I.A. – I.P., Manweller did not suggest a motive for I.A. to make false claims or identify a reason for her to say something that was not true. Neither did the investigation reveal evidence of such a motive. It seemed unlikely that I.A. would fabricate claims around so many verifiable details, particularly when this investigator initiated contact with her. It was not apparent that I.A. would have anything to gain from sharing her experience.

Finally, the interactions I.A. described had similarities with other conduct examined in this investigation, which supported the plausibility and credibility of I.A.’s claims. Among I.B. – I.P., eight other women’s accounts involved Manweller looking at their bodies, six others’ involved Manweller complimenting their physical characteristics, four others’ involved him asking them inappropriate personal questions, and three others’ involved experiences where he set up situations where he made it difficult for them to end the encounter.

2. Finding: Interviewee B

A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that Manweller looked at I.B.’s body on multiple occasions in the Politics and American Capitalism class she took from him in the fall of 2017. Specifically, the information gathered established that W.2. observed Manweller staring at I.B.’s body approximately once a week, depending on what she was wearing. The staring involved a very hard up and down kind of looking, and it included her whole body. It would occur around the end of class when students were packing up and were not really focusing on Manweller. I.B. would have felt uncomfortable if she had noticed it, and her friend W.2. felt

⁴⁰ Records provided to this investigator reflected that between receiving the detailed written information about the allegations on May 29 and his interview on June 5, Manweller – at a minimum – found time to locate and forward to his attorney a LinkedIn request from I.I. from 2016, locate and forward to his attorney email correspondence with I.A. from 2017, and send a 99-word email to his attorney about his whereabouts during March 2016.

somewhat bothered by the staring. The information that follows was considered in reaching this finding.

The evidence that could support a finding that Manweller did *not* engage in the alleged behavior was limited. When interviewed for this investigation, Manweller did not offer an unambiguous denial of the conduct. Rather, he stated that he did not remember W.2. and said that he did not remember staring at I.B.'s body. When asked if it was possible that he had, Manweller said he did not think it was possible that he would stare at I.B. in an inappropriate way in front of twenty other students.

In addition, one of the students in the class provided some information for consideration. W.26. informed this investigator that although he did not know I.B. well, he had spoken to her at a party on June 1, 2018. He characterized her state during that conversation as "clearly not sober." According to W.26., I.B. volunteered that the University had contacted her for the Manweller investigation, and she told W.26. that Manweller never made her feel uncomfortable.⁴¹

In sum, the information that could support a finding that Manweller did not behave as alleged included (a) Manweller's contention that he did not think the scenario was possible and (b) W.26. saying that he understood a less-than-sober I.B. to have told him that Manweller never made her feel uncomfortable.

The greater weight of the evidence supported a finding that Manweller looked at I.B.'s body as alleged.

I.B.'s friend W.2. provided compelling evidence that the staring occurred as described above. Both W.2. and I.B. agreed that he repeatedly told I.B. about the staring during that quarter. I.B. did not question the information provided by W.2. She said she has known him for a number of years, and does not believe he is making anything up.

While I.B. reported that she had not personally noticed the staring by Manweller that W.2. described, she stated that if she would have noticed it, she would have felt uncomfortable. She emphasized that such behavior was obviously inappropriate and inexcusable, and she would not be seeking out an opportunity to take another class from him in the future.

Another member of the class, W.23., who was interviewed at Manweller's request, volunteered that Manweller paid more attention to I.B. than to other students in the class, including but not limited to making more eye contact with her, looking at her more, and acting friendlier to her. W.23. added that after the allegations about Manweller came out, he was kind of thinking about Manweller and I.B. at that point and thought it was a bit bothersome.

While the fact that W.26. said that he believed I.B. told him that Manweller did not make her feel uncomfortable was of interest, it did not rise to the level of impacting the finding on this issue. Because I.B. never claimed to this investigator that Manweller *had* made her feel uncomfortable, making the statement W.26. claimed would not be inconsistent.

⁴¹ Despite multiple attempts, this investigator was unable to reach I.B. to seek a response.

Manweller did not suggest a motive for W.2. to make false claims or identify a reason he might say something that was not true. Neither did he address the motivation of W.23. This investigator initiated contact with both W.2. and W.23. (as well as with I.B.), and it was not apparent that they had anything to gain from fabricating information.

Furthermore, it was plausible that Manweller looked at I.B.'s body, as she was not the only student or former student for whom the evidence gathered supported a finding that Manweller had looked at her body. Eight other women had this experience.

3. Finding: Interviewee C

I.C. alleged that during the fall quarter of 2017 when she was taking a class from Manweller, he sat down at her table for about twenty minutes while she was eating lunch – without asking if he could join her and despite the fact that they had never had a conversation before. She said that Manweller asked her questions that she did not feel comfortable talking with a professor about, and she wanted to leave but did not particularly feel like she could. I.C. reported that she found the interaction weird and not fully welcome or comfortable. According to I.C., she was concerned that this encounter was related to the fact that she is female. She indicated that she did not feel entirely comfortable going to class after that and feared he would try to have a conversation with her again. I.C. also said she would not take another class from Manweller.

The evidence supported a finding that the alleged conduct by Manweller occurred, essentially as reported by I.C. When interviewed, Manweller acknowledged seeing her sitting by herself and sitting down and having lunch with her. Manweller did not contend that she invited him to sit down or maintain that he asked her permission first.

In addition to subjecting I.C. to unwelcome attention, Manweller created a situation where I.C. did not feel like she could leave. This placed the burden on her to go along with the unwanted attention (by staying there and answering his questions) or take responsibility to indicate to him that she was uncomfortable. The effect of the power differential was particularly significant in this case, as she was currently taking his class at the time. A reasonable person in such a situation would likely be concerned about potential negative repercussions if she communicated to him in any way that his attention was not entirely welcome.

4. Finding: Interviewee D

A preponderance of the evidence demonstrated that Manweller subjected I.D. to various unwelcome behaviors as alleged by I.D.:

- I.D. babysat for Manweller's boys from approximately November 2015 until June 2016. I.D. estimated the total number of times was around 15 to 20. With perhaps one exception, Manweller's wife would be traveling when I.D. babysat.
- Virtually every time she babysat, Manweller would compliment her appearance. This included telling her how beautiful she is, how hot she is, and that she is a "10." I.D. also recalled him commenting on her yoga pants. She perceived him to be "body scanning"

her all the time when he looked at her. I.D. experienced the compliments and body scanning as creepy, weird, and super inappropriate, and they made her uncomfortable.

- Manweller would initiate hugs goodbye. This happened often, although maybe not every time she babysat. There were times when he would give her a side hug and would not let go. He would put his hand on her lower back and leave his hand there. This happened at least a couple of times. She would let go, and she had the sense that he only let go because she did. I.D. felt uncomfortable and experienced the touching as creepy, not normal, and a weird thing to do to your babysitter.
- When Manweller came home, he would talk to her for a really long time – too long for her and up to 30 minutes. I.D. felt this was creepy. At times, when he would come home she would pretend to be on the phone so that she could get out of there. Sometimes she would want to leave but he had not given her her check yet. There were times when she just left without a check so that she could go.
- On one occasion, Manweller made jokes to I.D. that she found weird, like “oh, you could stay over” and “you could stay in the guest room.”
- At one point Manweller invited her to go out for drinks. He said something like “I will be at the Starlight if you want to stop by.” She did not see this as normal behavior with a babysitter.
- When Manweller would get home, he offered her drinks on almost every occasion.
- On one occasion, which she guessed to be around March 2016, when Manweller got home he offered her a glass of wine, and she decided to accept. After he got the drinks, she sat at one end of the couch, and he initially was sitting at the other end of the couch. They talked about her school and his work, and he asked her what she wanted to do. He kept inching closer to her, and eventually his hand was touching the side of her knee. She looked down and saw his hand there, and she is sure she felt it. This behavior caused I.D. to feel really weird, upset, and really creeped out. She left and cried all the way home. She continued to babysit for Manweller for a few more months because she needed the money.

Some of the facts were not in dispute. I.D. and Manweller agreed that she babysat for his boys frequently during the 2015-16 school year. I.D. was also working at the ECLC during this period of time, her senior year at the University. Although they disagreed on what proportion of the time, I.D. and Manweller agreed that there were occasions when I.D. babysat for the boys when his wife was not present. Manweller acknowledged times when he offered I.D. a drink after babysitting. Neither was it in dispute that Manweller primarily lived in the Olympia area during the 2016 legislative session.

The evidence that could support a finding that Manweller did not engage in the alleged behavior was limited. He denied some of the allegations and said there were some things he did not remember.

Manweller denied complimenting I.D.'s physical attractiveness, denied giving I.D. an inappropriate hug or touching her as she described, and denied inviting her to drinks. He initially did not directly deny I.D.'s account of him touching her knee on the couch; rather, he changed the subject to his whereabouts during March of 2016, the month that I.D. guessed it had occurred. When asked in a follow up question if the situation with him touching her knee on the couch ever happened, Manweller said no.

There were some things he said he did not remember. He said he did not recall ever body scanning I.D.; he did not deny having done so. Although he had denied inviting I.D. to drinks, when asked if he suggested she stop by the Starlight, he said he did not remember that. As for joking about I.D. staying overnight, Manweller said he did not remember specifically.

The greater weight of the evidence supported a finding that Manweller engaged in the conduct as alleged by I.D.

Two witnesses, W.3. and W.4., corroborated I.D.'s account. W.3. is I.D.'s sister. She reported that she was aware of I.D. babysitting for Manweller's children, and on several occasions, I.D. called her at night after she got done babysitting. W.3. said she recalled I.D. telling her that Manweller touched her when he was talking to her, offered her drinks, and offered for her to stay the night. She described I.D. as weirded out, upset, and really uncomfortable.

W.4., a professor at CWU, reported that I.D. told her that she babysat for Manweller's children a number of times when his wife was not there. She said that I.D. shared with her that Manweller made her feel really uncomfortable. W.4. stated that I.D. described Manweller touching her shoulder, arm, and back and told her about a time when Manweller asked her to go out drinking. W.4. also said that I.D. told her that Manweller would come home and would not let her get away, by not paying I.D. right away; there would be kind of an extended negotiation to get her money and leave.

Some of the information Manweller provided was not only denied by I.D. but also implausible. Manweller's contention that he and his wife had a policy that babysitters stay 15 minutes after his/her/their arrival home – even if the boys were asleep – seemed unlikely.⁴² Manweller maintained that the babysitter would still stay for the fifteen minutes even if the boys were asleep, because he would want a debrief. He described this as their “standard practice.” Even assuming for the sake of argument that he may have wanted a detailed debrief when the boys were asleep, there would be no need to have a set period of time for it, i.e., fifteen minutes; common sense would seem to dictate that the debrief would simply last as long as needed – and no longer.

Other implausible information provided by Manweller arose when asked in his interview if I.D. was ever on the phone when he got home and stayed on the phone as she left. He said no, never. He asserted that it would probably be inappropriate for I.D. to be on the phone and added that he would have talked to her about it. When asked if it was not okay for her to be on the phone even if the boys were asleep, he said probably. He said texting was maybe okay but not being on the

⁴² Manweller's claims about a 20 minute walk through of the boys' food and medicine, even if the babysitter already knew them, also seemed implausible but were not directly relevant to any of I.D.'s specific allegations.

phone. This sequence of responses described what seemed an unlikely set of expectations that Manweller did not seem to be clear on himself, given his use of “probably” twice. If he had a restriction for babysitters regarding their use of the phone, it would be reasonable to expect him to be clear on what exactly what it was without the use of qualifiers such as “probably” and “maybe.”

As for the allegation about Manweller inching closer to I.D. on the couch and touching her knee, the undisputed fact that he spent a good deal of time in the Olympia area in March 2016 was not dispositive. First, I.D. indicated from the first time she spoke with this investigator that she was guessing at the timeframe. Second, it was never established that he never spent a day or night at home during March 2016.

W.25., the longtime ECLC employee, did not provide evidence in support of Manweller. Manweller – through his attorney – had asserted that W.25. would “offer significant, relevant observations and comments regarding [I.D.’s] behavior during the timeframe in which she made her allegations against Dr. Manweller.” I.D.’s allegations involving Manweller related to the timeframe she babysat for his boys – from the fall of 2015 until June of 2016. W.25. indicated that I.D. worked at the ECLC that school year, from September 16, 2015 through June 15, 2016. W.25. did not provide significant or relevant observations about unusual behavior during this time period. Manweller’s attorney further requested that W.25. be asked “whether [I.D.] made any allegations and/or accusations against anyone else that W.25. believes were strange and/or unfounded.” When asked this question, W.25. said no and further indicated that dishonesty had not been an issue with I.D. at the ECLC.

Neither the investigation nor Manweller revealed any motive for I.D. to fabricate a claim against him. This investigator initiated contact with I.D. and did not identify anything for I.D. to gain from sharing her concerns. There was no evidence that the babysitting relationship ended on a less than positive note. Manweller indicated that things with I.D. ended cordially, and said they got her a graduation gift.

Finally, the plausibility and credibility of I.D.’s account were supported by the similarities between what I.D. described and the accounts of the other women. This included but was not limited to three other women maintaining that he touched their knees, eight other women with reports of him looking at their bodies, six others who claimed he complimented their physical characteristics, and three others who experienced situations where he made it difficult to leave the encounter.

5. Finding: Interviewee E

A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that in October 2015, Manweller subjected I.E. to inappropriate attention by looking at her body and sending her unwelcome email correspondence.

W.5., one of I.E.’s fellow students on the Psychology Club visit to the Ellensburg campus, reported that a male Political Science professor was being especially creepy towards I.E. W.5. stated that when she saw I.E. and the professor talking, he seemed overly interested and was just a little too physically close to I.E. W.5. said that as I.E. walked away from the professor, he

would not stop staring at her and her rear end, despite the fact that W.5. and possibly others were looking her direction in anticipation of her rejoining the group. According to W.5., she told I.E. that the professor would not stop staring at her and her rear end. She said the professor's behavior made I.E. really uncomfortable.

I.E. stated that she does not doubt that Manweller was looking at her body as described. She found it completely unwelcome, and everything about it – the venue, the time, the power dynamic, him being an authority figure – was inappropriate.

Unlike I.E., whose witness supported her account, Manweller's version of what occurred in the hallway when he encountered the student group was not supported by his witness, W.24.⁴³ Manweller claimed that he did not remember whether he talked to I.E. in the hallway. When asked if he stared at I.E.'s rear end, Manweller said he didn't think that happened. He did not clearly deny it or exclude the possibility that he could have done it.

Manweller acknowledged that at some point he and I.E. exchanged business cards (with him giving her his legislative card and I.E. giving Manweller a card with her personal email). He said he did not remember where this occurred or what she said. Manweller did not dispute the content of the email that he sent her that evening from his personal email account:

It was nice meeting you today. Thanks for making the trip all the way over to Ellensburg. Just wanted you to have my contact information that was not related to the Legislature. Hope you made it back safe. Feel free to contact me if you ever need [any]thing.

When interviewed, I.E. indicated that she found it weird for Manweller to send this email and give her his personal contact information. She was clear that she felt pretty taken aback by this communication and did not view Manweller's behavior as professional or appropriate

When asked what his reason was for giving I.E. his personal email, Manweller said that a year earlier he had been called into the Dean's office, because he had received political email at his CWU account. According to Manweller, Dean Johnson suggested that receiving such email constituted use of CWU email for political resources. However, Manweller's representation of the issue Dean Johnson had raised with him conflicted with the content of the documentation provided by the University. A July 15, 2013 letter to Manweller reflected that, in contrast to what he had claimed in his interview for this investigation, the focus of Dean Johnson's concern was

⁴³ Manweller claimed that he encountered the visiting group when he was in the hallway and one of the Psychology professors, W.24., was teasing him about being a state representative. According to Manweller, he did an impromptu Q&A with the visiting students. However, W.24.'s account was not consistent with Manweller's. When interviewed, in regard to whether he gave a tour to the visiting students and witnessed Manweller engage in an impromptu Q&A with the group, W.24. said absolutely not. After the information from W.24. was shared with Manweller, his attorney asked that the Psychology professor hosting the event be interviewed. The Psychology professor described by I.E. as hosting the visit was contacted much earlier in the investigation. Although that professor declined to communicate directly with this investigator, he did confirm through communication with Executive Director of Human Resources Staci Sleigh-Layman that the group in question had visited Ellensburg, and he gave them a campus tour.

not political emails received by Manweller at his CWU account. Rather, at issue were two different political emails sent by Manweller to two CWU employees at their CWU email accounts.

In addition to Manweller's representation conflicting with Dean Johnson's documentation, his explanation for sending I.E. the email was implausible. Given that I.E. had given him her personal (Gmail) email address, and he had given her his Legislature business card with his Legislature email, there was no apparent reason why he should reasonably have any concern about political use of his CWU email with I.E. Once they exchanged cards with their non-CWU email addresses, CWU email should not have been an issue.

Manweller did not suggest a motive for I.E. or W.5. to make false claims or identify a reason for them to say something that was not true. This investigator initiated the contact with both I.E. and W.5., and the investigation did not reveal evidence that either of them would have anything to gain from sharing their experiences.

I.E.'s and W.5.'s assertions were plausible and credible. The evidence gathered in the investigation established that eight other women had experiences of Manweller looking at their body and many others experienced unwelcome attention from him.

For all of these reasons, the evidence supported a finding that Manweller subjected I.E. to inappropriate attention by looking at her body and sending her unwelcome email correspondence.

6. Finding: Interviewee F

I.F. alleged that at a reception in Olympia in January 2014, for approximately five to ten minutes she experienced an encounter with Manweller that felt sexually motivated and gross. She also stated that she felt creeped out and devalued. I.F. maintained that Manweller:

- got physically close to her, in her personal bubble, and was very "in her face."
- focused on her chest with a look she described as "examining," rather than looking her in the eye.
- made her feel very hit upon by telling her they needed to get to know each other better and saying they were going to work very closely together when she knew they were not.

The evidence gathered supported a finding that it was more likely than not that the interaction occurred as described by I.F. The details of the event (date, location, purpose) were confirmed and consistent with what I.F. reported. Manweller did not provide a compelling response to I.F.'s allegations. When asked if he stood close to her, leaned in, and focused on I.F.'s chest, Manweller said he did not think that happened. Notably, he did not specifically deny it. When asked about I.F.'s statements about feeling "hit upon" and his behavior being "sexually motivated," Manweller claimed that he did not know what that means – an assertion that did not seem credible.

Manweller did not suggest any motive for I.F. to fabricate this claim. Neither did the information gathered reveal such a motive. This investigator initiated contact with I.F., and there was no indication that she had anything to gain by raising a false allegation.

Further support for this finding came from the similarities with other information gathered. For example, eight other women's accounts included Manweller looking at their bodies.

7. Finding: Interviewee G

A preponderance of the evidence established that Manweller engaged in the conduct attributed to him by I.G. Specifically:

- I.G. enrolled in one class with Manweller in the spring of 2009, when she was a 19 year old single mom with a three year old son. During the quarter, her son was very ill and had to be hospitalized, which impacted her attendance. When Manweller knew she was behind in his class, he offered to get drinks with her at the Starlight, but she did not accept.
- After Manweller told I.G. that he could meet with her in the evening, she went to his office and he closed the office door behind her. When she sat down, he pulled up a chair right next to her, although there was no need to be that close. Manweller asked her how her dating life was as a single mom and talked to her in a tone she perceived as flirtatious.
- He then leaned in a little bit closer and put his hand on her right knee. His palm was open and face-down. As he put his hand on her knee, he said: "There's always a way for you to get an A in this class." He also made another statement similar to this one that conveyed the same message, although she no longer recalls the words he used. It was clear to her that he was offering her other ways to earn an A that did not involve course work, and understood this to mean a sexual favor for an easy A. I.G. did not think that he may have meant something else.
- She felt offended and in shock, and felt that he had absolutely crossed the line. I.G. withdrew from Manweller's course immediately. If this incident in Manweller's office had not happened, she would have finished his class. Manweller later emailed her at least once asking about anything he could help with and her son.

Certain facts were not in dispute in the investigation. Manweller knew I.G. and her family before she took his class. I.G. is the daughter of a friend he knows through politics. It was not in dispute that I.G.'s three year old son was in the hospital and I.G. was struggling to keep up in Manweller's class.

Manweller denied that he invited I.G. for drinks, touched her knee, or offered a quid pro quo. When asked if he had closed the office door and pulled his chair close to I.G., Manweller did not explicitly deny it. However, he did say that where he sits in his office is not close enough to touch somebody and drew a diagram. He denied ever sitting in one of the other chairs in his office for visitors.

On several key points, Manweller did not deny I.G.'s claims but said he did not remember. This included whether he had talked to I.G. about her dating life as a single mom and whether he had

talked to her in a flirtatious tone. He said he did not remember the specifics of the conversation and did not remember telling I.G. that there was always a way for her to get an A in the class.

The evidence to support I.G.'s allegations was more compelling than Manweller's denials and statements that he did not remember. The following factors were considered in reaching this finding.

I.G.'s account was corroborated by multiple sources. First, University records confirmed that she withdrew from Manweller's course and completed her two other courses that quarter. University records further confirmed that I.G. did not withdraw from other courses while at CWU.

Second, I.G.'s sister, W.7., provided support. W.7. said she recalled I.G. telling her about her experience with Manweller when it happened, and the gist was a sexual advance. W.7. said that her understanding was that I.G. didn't want to risk a bad grade by not going along with what Manweller wanted.

Third, I.G. provided a very specific description of Manweller's furniture arrangement at the time of her experience. She described Manweller's desk being in front of the window, facing the door, with two chairs in between the desk and the door. Her diagram and details strongly resembled the information provided by I.L., whose claims had substantial similarities to I.G.'s.⁴⁴ Both described Manweller moving his chair in close, and both said the chair they sat in and the chair he sat in were in front of his desk. During the investigation, Manweller was provided with this information obtained from I.G. and I.L., but he did not offer a response.

Additionally, it is difficult to imagine that a person with no apparent motive would fabricate claims based on such a difficult life experience, i.e., the serious illness and hospitalization of her three year old son while she attempted to manage a full time college schedule. This seems especially true in light of the fact that this investigator initiated contact with I.G.; I.G. had not taken any steps to report her concerns.

Moreover, I.G.'s allegations were similar to other claims found to be supported in this investigation. I.G. was not the only person to describe being in Manweller's office while he asked her questions about dating as a single mom; I.H. also described such an experience. Neither was I.G. the only female student or former student to report Manweller touching her knee while propositioning her; I.L. shared a very similar experience. And two more women – I.D. and I.I. – described him touching their knees. Also, two other women (I.H. and I.L.) reported Manweller attempting further communication after they had unambiguously indicated his behavior was unwelcome, and six other women shared accounts of him acting inappropriately toward them in his office. For these reasons, I.G.'s assertions were plausible and credible.

One of the issues raised by I.G. was less straight-forward in terms of making a finding. I.G. stated that near the beginning of the quarter that I.G. took his class, Manweller told her he could write her a good recommendation letter for law school. Yet, she noted, at the beginning of the course, he would not have known what kind of student she was. There was another occasion

⁴⁴ I.G. and I.L. both reported that they did not know, or know of, the other.

when she overheard Manweller offer a letter of recommendation to a young female student at an event center. I.G. emphasized that she thought offering letters of recommendation to female students in this way seemed inappropriate and something he could hold over people, like “you need me.” Similarly, I.L. had also had concerns about her situation with Manweller in regard to a letter of recommendation, and said she thought this was why he felt he could proposition her.

Manweller did not deny offering letters of recommendation to students who wanted to go to graduate school or law school, even if he did not yet know them and their work. As to the account of him offering a letter to a female student at the event center, he said he did not remember. When asked about the notion of a letter of recommendation being something he could hold over someone, Manweller said that was absolutely not true. Manweller stated that the goal is to make students successful and get them into grad school or law school.

The notion of a tenured professor offering letters of recommendation to students whose work he does not yet know seems unusual in a University environment, and the need to initiate such an offer is not apparent. In light of the findings of other gender-based conduct in this case, the facts at hand raised a question as to whether an aspect of Manweller’s offering of letters of recommendation may be gender-based. Nevertheless, during the investigation there was no allegation that these offers did not include males, and neither did any information surface along these lines. Accordingly, the information was insufficient to make a finding on whether the conduct was gender-based.

8. Finding: Interviewee H

The evidence supported a finding that it was more likely than not that the alleged conduct by Manweller occurred, essentially as reported by I.H. Briefly, this included the following actions from 2009:

- An experience in Manweller’s office where he was hitting on I.H. the entire meeting. He flirted in the way he was speaking to her, made several direct comments about how attractive she was, asked her about her dating life as a single mom, and kept trying to keep the conversation going when she kept trying to wrap up. She felt uncomfortable and could not wait to go.
- Five to ten subsequent encounters where Manweller would be in the hallway when I.H. was getting out of class and did not seem to have a reason to be there. He would always say hi and would walk with her wherever she was headed.
- An experience where he invited her to a lunch at a nice restaurant (Sazon) with her understanding that the purpose was to talk about presenting her project at the SOURCE Symposium. When she arrived he grabbed her elbow/arm, as though he were helping her to sit and tried to lean in for a side hug. Manweller told I.H. that he could not stop thinking about her, said he was dreaming about her, said he wanted to run away with her, and told her he knew how wrong it was or how much trouble he could get in. This went on for some time. When I.H. left, he yelled after her: “Don’t go.” When she was getting into her car, he grabbed her on the forearm and she pushed him off. She thought he was trying to kiss her. She felt confused and in shock.

- A few subsequent attempts to contact I.H. via Facebook over the next couple of months and year, which she characterized as a “can we talk” type of thing.

Manweller and I.H. agreed on some things. They both said I.H. was going to be presenting at SOURCE, and both described the same topic area of her project. It was not in dispute that W.8. facilitated the connection, and they met. And, although their accounts diverged dramatically, they both said that they had lunch together on one occasion.

Manweller denied some of the allegations, said that he did not think some of the alleged conduct happened, and said there were some things he did not remember. Manweller denied telling I.H. how attractive she was and denied telling her he could not stop thinking about her. He denied her descriptions of what occurred inside and outside the restaurant. He also denied I.H.’s claim that there had been five to ten occasions when he appeared after a class and walked with her.

When asked about I.H.’s description of their meeting in his office, Manweller said he did not think that happened. In regard to asking about her dating life as a single mom and whether she was with the father of her child, Manweller said he did not remember any conversation of that nature. He did not deny sending follow up messages to I.H. on Facebook. He said that he had looked for Facebook messages but could not find any.

The greater weight of evidence supported a finding that Manweller engaged in the conduct alleged by I.H.

As with the other women, Manweller did not suggest a motive for I.H. to make false claims or identify a reason she might say something that was not true. It seemed unlikely that I.H. would fabricate claims around so many verifiable details, particularly when this investigator initiated contact with her. It was not apparent that I.H. would have anything to gain from sharing her experience.

I.H. provided a very detailed account of her interactions with Manweller, describing with specificity what happened in his office, how he initially approached her, how he would make a point of walking with her in the hallway, and what happened at the lunch and where it was.⁴⁵

The interactions I.H. described had similarities with other conduct described in this investigation, which supported the plausibility and credibility of I.H.’s claims. In particular, among I.A. – I.P., there were various others with whom he acting flirtatiously, complimented their appearance, communicated with sexual or romantic overtones, touched them, acted inappropriately in his office, and made efforts to communicate following unambiguous indications that his behavior was unwelcome. Two of them, I.A. and I.G., also reported that he had asked them questions about their dating life.

⁴⁵ Research reflected that there formerly was a restaurant in Ellensburg called Sazon located at 412 N. Main Street.

9. Finding: Interviewee I

The information gathered established that it was more likely than not that Manweller engaged in a variety of inappropriate conduct with I.I., including:

- Going drinking with I.I., which occurred over a period of time when she was taking classes from him.
- Talking about sex and asking I.I. sexual questions.
- Making inappropriate comments about men wanting to date her.
- Grabbing her knee in the Political Science office.
- Acting very flirtatious with her in his office, including using very suggestive flattering tones.

Although I.I. was frank that the attention from Manweller was not unwelcome at the time it occurred (she was a CWU student from 2004-08), she emphasized that she now considers it inappropriate and emotionally manipulative, particularly in light of Manweller's position of power over her.

The fact that Manweller stopped short of denying nearly all of the conduct was a key factor in reaching this finding.

I.I. asserted that after she turned 21 in mid-March of her junior year (2007), she would go drinking with Manweller around once a month, sometimes one on one but usually with a particular female friend, I.K. I.I. stated that some of the times when they went drinking I.I. was enrolled in his class. Manweller acknowledged having drinks with I.I. and I.K. He said he did not remember if it had happened during times when I.I. had been taking his class. However, he did not exclude the possibility that this could have been the case. University records reflected that this was possible, because after I.I. turned 21 she took two more classes with Manweller, one in the summer of 2007 and another in the spring of 2008.

I.I. reported that when she and I.K. were drinking with Manweller he would ask them personal questions about sex. I.I. gave the example that if she slept with a fellow student, Manweller would press for more information and want to know how it was. She said this happened multiple times. In her interview, I.K. corroborated I.I.'s claims of Manweller talking to the two of them about sex, and she offered her own examples of personal sexual questions he asked. When asked if he talked about sex with I.I., Manweller did not say no. Rather, he said he did not remember the nature of the conversation eleven years ago. He did not deny it or exclude the possibility that it could have happened.

On a related note, I.I. contended that Manweller would say inappropriate things about men wanting to date her and her appeal to men. When asked if he made comments about men wanting to date her, Manweller said he could not offer a specific recollection of conversations at a bar. He did not deny it or exclude the possibility that it could have happened.

I.I. maintained that there was an occasion in the Political Science office when Manweller grabbed her knee, with his palm fully clasped around it, and said “really nice to see you” in a slow suggestive tone. When asked about I.I.’s account of him grabbing her knee, Manweller said he did not remember. Although he added that he did not believe that happened, he did not clearly deny it or exclude the possibility that it could have happened.

I.I. claimed that Manweller acted very flirtatious and playful in his office, and used very suggestive, flattering tones. On this topic, Manweller was clearer in his denials than he was with I.I.’s other allegations, although he did acknowledge that I.I. would come to his office.

The investigation did not reveal a motive for I.I. to fabricate information, and Manweller did not suggest any such motive for I.I. Contact with I.I. for this investigation was initiated by this investigator, not I.I. It was not apparent that I.I. would have anything to gain by bringing a false claim.

The interactions with Manweller described by I.I. had similarities with other conduct explored in this investigation, which supported the plausibility and credibility of I.I.’s claims. In addition to the three women who also described Manweller touching their knees, other women shared accounts of him communicating about sex or with sexual overtones, asking inappropriate personal questions, and acting inappropriately in his office.

There were two areas of behavior alleged by I.I. that lacked sufficient information to establish that it was more likely than not that they occurred. This is not to suggest a finding that they did not occur; there simply was not enough information.

The first one involved I.I.’s characterization of Manweller engaging in “grooming” behavior, by flattering her to the point where she would open up and share with him. According to I.I., these interactions usually led to inappropriate conversations that she felt he could potentially use against her. In response, Manweller said he did not know what grooming behavior means. After this investigator explained what I.I. had said, Manweller stated that he did not have anything to add on that. This investigator did not find reason to doubt I.I.’s sincerity in raising this concept or question the accuracy of her factual descriptions. Yet in the absence of a clear, commonly-accepted definition of grooming, and lacking sufficiently detailed information about what occurred, this investigator was unable to reach a finding that Manweller engaged in inappropriate “grooming.”

The second area concerned I.I.’s contention that at the end of the spring quarter of 2008 (her last quarter at CWU), Manweller came up to her at The Tav, whispered in her ear that he had just posted grades, and said her grade. I.I. explained that she perceived his intent to be telling her they were no longer teacher and student. When interviewed, Manweller said he had no recollection of such a situation, but he said he was sorry I.I. perceived it that way if he said that. He stated that in the last weeks of school, he receives numerous questions from students asking when grades are going to be out. While it is certainly possible that Manweller said what I.I. alleged and she accurately perceived his intent, the nature of the communication she described was too ambiguous to make a finding that it was more likely than not that his intent was to tell her they were no longer teacher and student.

10. Finding: Interviewee K

I.K., a student at CWU from 2003-07, reported that she and her friend I.I. went drinking with Manweller during her senior year. I.K. also described various inappropriate behaviors by Manweller:

- Touching her thigh, hair, shoulder, and waist
- Complimenting her body (which would require first looking at and appraising her body)
- Telling her he was attracted to women with her hair color
- Talking to her and I.I. about sex and asking them personal questions about sex, such as how they lost their virginity and whether they were using birth control

While I.K. was clear that she did not feel uncomfortable with these interactions at the time, during this investigation she explained that she views Manweller's behavior as inappropriate and thinks that he should have known better.

A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that Manweller engaged in the conduct claimed by I.K. He did not deny drinking with I.K. and I.I. when they were students, and he acknowledged that he sometimes paid for their drinks. As for the other alleged behaviors, he claimed no recollection of these actions. Significantly, he also did not deny them or claim that he would never have engaged in such behaviors with students.

Manweller did not offer an explanation for why I.K. would make any claim that was not true. Neither did the investigation reveal any such motive for I.K. Contact with I.K. was initiated by this investigator, and it was not apparent that she had anything to gain by fabricating information.

The plausibility and credibility of I.K.'s assertions were supported by similar experiences shared by other women. These included five other women who described Manweller touching them, eight other women whose bodies he looked at, six others who experienced compliments based on physical characteristics, four others to whom he directed personal questions, and others to whom he communicated about sex or with sexual overtones.

11. Finding: Interviewee L

A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that Manweller engaged in the unwelcome conduct alleged by I.L. This finding includes:

- During the summer of 2006, I.L. took a class from Manweller and also was enrolled in an individual study with him.

- Manweller was flirty toward I.L. in his tone of voice, leering eyes, and a gross grin that was kind of a leering look. She observed this in the two week period before she went to his office to meet with him about the individual study.
- Prior to the day she went to his office, I.L. was standing in the back of the class because she had a sore neck. She was wearing a knee length skirt. While she was standing, Manweller had a leering look on his face and was looking her up and down.
- After she arrived at his office to meet about the individual study, Manweller closed the office door and moved his chair so that he was sitting pretty close to her. He told her the sexual energy between the two of them was undeniable. He talked about the skirt she had worn in class and how she looked in it. He said “let’s be adults about this” and “we can be discreet.” He called her boyfriend a boy. He told her: “You don’t want to write the paper and I don’t want to read it.” He made what she understood to be a reference to oral sex: he said they could go to a hotel and “discuss it orally.” He then touched I.L., putting his fingertips right above her knee with his palm down. The touch felt sexual. He leaned in and kissed her on the mouth.
- I.L. was in shock, upset, and disturbed about what happened in Manweller’s office. She also had concerns about retaliation. At the time she went to Manweller’s office, she and her boyfriend had already asked Manweller for letters of recommendation for law school and were counting on him. She feared that he would not do the letters for her or her boyfriend or give her a bad grade.
- Not long after the office incident, Manweller came into her workplace, a deli. He apparently knew she worked there, but I.L. did not know how he knew, because she did not tell him. When she saw him, she hid in the kitchen. Then the manager told her that someone was asking for her. Manweller told I.L. that her boyfriend had come by asking about his letter of recommendation. He said something about being really busy but would find time to do the letter. She does not remember if he mentioned her letter also, although she is inclined to say he did. Manweller was not being friendly like he had been before. He left without ordering anything. I.L. found it pretty bold that he just came in to discuss this. I.L. felt like Manweller was trying to hold the letter over her head and felt really rattled.
- I.L. did not submit a paper for the individual study, although she received credit for it.
- Before the office incident, I.L. had wanted to take another class taught by Manweller. She did not, because she felt she had to avoid him. Had the office incident not occurred, she probably would have taken more classes from Manweller.
- A couple of years after the office incident, Manweller called her mother’s phone looking for I.L., although I.L. had not given him her mother’s number.

When interviewed for this investigation, Manweller declined to answer questions about I.L.’s allegations and did not address the questions of whether the 2012 investigation report had quoted him accurately and whether there was relevant information that had not been included in the

report. Without information from Manweller about the substance of I.L.'s complaints, this investigation had to rely on the limited information provided by Manweller set forth in the 2012 investigation report.

The 2012 report identified three things Manweller raised to defend against I.L.'s allegations. First, Manweller claimed that he did not know who I.L. is or whether she was a student at the University. In determining that Manweller's "credibility was not as strong as the other witnesses," the investigator based this on reasons including:

1. I.L. took several classes with Manweller over the course of several years
2. He approved an Individual Study Permit for her
3. He submitted a Change of Grade Form for her
4. He wrote her a letter of recommendation for law school
5. He remembered many details about I.L.'s former boyfriend and a particular classmate and friend of I.L.'s but allegedly nothing about I.L.

Second, Manweller contended that he was being targeted, because he was running for office.

Third, Manweller maintained that I.L.'s allegations and the rumors about his conduct toward female students stemmed from a misinterpretation. The report explained:

According to Dr. Manweller, rumors about him dating students began when he used to be married to a CWU student, who he met prior to his employment at CWU. Dr. Manweller stated that he was occasionally seen off campus holding her hand and kissing her in public.

This was the extent of Manweller's explanations in defense of the allegations.

The greater weight of the evidence supported a finding that it was more likely than not that Manweller engaged in the conduct alleged by I.L. To begin with, the investigation revealed a substantial amount of corroborating information.

University records corroborated I.L.'s account. A copy of her individual study form showed that it was approved as a graded course. Yet on the grade change form completed by Manweller, he did not issue her a grade. The fact that initially Manweller gave I.L. an Incomplete is consistent with her not turning in a paper for the class. Yet changing from an Incomplete to "S" (i.e., not a grade) conflicted with what had been approved for her individual study. Both the Incomplete and the S reflect that something happened that was unusual and a departure from what was approved.⁴⁶

⁴⁶ The 2012 investigation report did not indicate that Manweller gave an explanation for the change of grade form at that time. And because he opted not to answer questions or provide information related to I.L.'s allegations during the current investigation, the record contains no explanation from Manweller.

W.8., the Political Science Department Chair in 2006, corroborated I.L.'s assertion that she met with him to complain about what happened with Manweller not long after her experience in his office. W.8. reported that I.L. told him about the individual study and Manweller saying: "You don't want to write it and I don't want to read it." He said she also described Manweller telling her that they should get a hotel room. W.8. stated that I.L. seemed uncomfortable. W.8. indicated that his impression was that I.L. was intimidated and worried about a letter of recommendation from Manweller. W.8. stated that he did not have reason to think that I.L. made the story up; he didn't know her and had no way to judge her.

Corroboration was also provided by W.11., W.12., and W.13., all of whom reported hearing contemporaneous accounts from I.L. about her experience. W.11., I.L.'s sister, stated that I.L. told her about her experience with the professor either the day it occurred or the day after, and I.L. seemed alarmed and disturbed. According to W.11., I.L. told her that the professor had said he had noticed her in class and said they would have good chemistry or something like this, and he leaned into her. W.11. stated that I.L. told her that the professor told her that they could work out another arrangement other than doing the assignment, implying something sexual.

W.12., a former boyfriend of I.L., said he remembered that I.L. was really upset about her experience with the professor in his office and raised it with W.12. right away. He reported that I.L. told him that the professor made sexual advances toward her.

W.13. attended CWU with I.L., and they were good friends. W.13. reported that I.L. told her about her experience with the Political Science professor in his office at the time it happened and was very bothered about it. W.13. said that I.L. told her that the professor had been touching her leg/knee and was too close. W.13. said she kind of remembers an independent study. She said she does not recall more details.⁴⁷

W.10., I.L.'s mother, confirmed I.L.'s account of Manweller telephoning W.10.'s home a couple of years after I.L. left CWU. She said he told her he was looking for I.L. and said something like: "I want to get a hold of her."

Further corroboration was provided by I.L.'s very specific description of Manweller's furniture arrangement at the time of her experience. Because Manweller had essentially claimed that I.G.'s allegations about him sitting close to her in his office were simply not possible, and I.L.'s claims were very similar to I.G.'s, a copy of his drawing of his office floor plan was provided to I.L. to review. After reviewing it, I.L. stated that the furniture arrangement in Manweller's drawing was different than it was when she was in his office. I.L.'s description was substantially similar to I.G.'s. Like I.G., I.L. explained that Manweller's desk had been in front of the window and there were chairs between the desk and the door. Both described Manweller moving his chair in close to their chair, with both his chair and their chair being in front of his desk.

⁴⁷ While W.13. recalled limited facts nearly twelve years after the incident, the information she provided supported a contemporaneous account from I.L. about unwelcome behavior from Manweller that involved, at a minimum, him touching her leg/knee and being too close.

The information gathered in the investigation did not reflect evidence of a motive for I.L. to misrepresent what occurred with Manweller. In the 2012 investigation of I.L.'s allegations, according to the investigation report, Manweller suggested that his candidacy for office or his prior marriage to a CWU student were the real basis for I.L.'s allegations and the rumors about him and female students. The 2012 report did not identify any evidence to substantiate these contentions, and the current investigation did not reveal such evidence either. In any case, in the current investigation, Manweller did not assert that he was being targeted because he was running for office or raise the issue of his previous marriage to a former CWU student.

Numerous similarities between I.L.'s description of her experience and the accounts of other women supported the plausibility and credibility of I.L.'s allegations.

- Both I.L. and I.G. reported Manweller offering them an educational benefit in exchange for sex.
- The accounts of eight other women also involved Manweller looking at their bodies.
- Three other women reported him touching their knees.
- Five others described communications from Manweller with sexual or romantic overtones.
- Six other women said he complimented their physical characteristics.
- Six others reported him acting inappropriately in his office.
- And two other women described Manweller attempting to communicate with them after they gave him unambiguous indications that his behavior was unwelcome.

12. Finding: Interviewee M

The evidence gathered supported a finding that Manweller's conduct was welcome to I.M. at the time it occurred, but she now recognizes it as highly unprofessional and inappropriate.

I.M. and Manweller had some consensual interactions while she was a student at CWU in 2006. Manweller did not deny these consensual interactions but declined to elaborate on them. While he maintained in his interview that I.M. had been a graduate student at the time, this information was not correct. I.M. graduated with an undergraduate degree in psychology in 2007.

Based on email messages and information provided by I.M., the information reflected that on multiple subsequent occasions Manweller made overtures to her that were not invited or appreciated. He said that he did not remember them and did not provide explanations.

13. Finding: Interviewee N

A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that the alleged conduct by Manweller occurred as reported by I.N. Specifically, while she was in high school/Running Start (2003-05):

- Manweller knew that she was still in high school.
- Manweller told I.N. and another high school/Running Start student, W.16., that W.16.'s clothing reminded him of Daisy Duke, and said that he had such a big crush on Daisy Duke.

- On one occasion in his office, Manweller asked what her plans were for that night; told her his wife was out of town; gave her his cell phone number on the back of his business card; and told I.N. that if her friend could not go to a movie with her, he would “chaperone” her. She was 17 years old. The experience made her feel terrible and made a strong impression on her. I.N. found Manweller to be a creep. But for this situation in his office, she would have majored in Political Science.

Additionally, in the fall of 2005, after she had graduated from high school, Manweller showed her unwelcome attention when he followed her into a classroom in Hertz Hall once or twice. She recalled one occasion very specifically:

- Manweller was standing at her desk, while she was sitting.
- He was saying things like “how are you,” “how was your summer.” He was really smiley and friendly.
- I.N. was not speaking and found the experience upsetting.

When interviewed, Manweller did not deny any of the alleged conduct. He asserted that he did not recognize I.N.’s name. While he did say “Why would I offer to chaperone someone to the movies,” he did not deny that the situation occurred or exclude the possibility that it could have occurred. Although he was aware from the information provided to him that I.N. was a minor during two of the incidents (including the situation when he offered to chaperone her to the movies), Manweller neither addressed the issue of her being a minor nor denied that he would have engaged in such conduct with a minor. Manweller also contended that he did not remember W.16. He said he did not remember talking to anyone about Daisy Duke but did not deny that this was something he could have done.

I.N.’s account of Manweller’s offer to go to the movies with her was corroborated by her friend, W.15. W.15. reported that I.N. had shared a contemporaneous account with her the same day it happened. She said that I.N. had told her that Manweller had asked her to go to a movie with him earlier that day, and she recalled that I.N. was super uncomfortable about what had happened. W.15. and I.N. both identified the same movie that the two of them ended up seeing that night: *Napoleon Dynamite*.

Information obtained from W.16. (I.N.’s high school/Running Start friend) also provided some corroboration for I.N.’s account. Like I.N., W.16. stated that she was pretty sure that Manweller knew she was in high school. While W.16. did not report recalling the Daisy Duke situation, she did say that she had had a negative interaction with Manweller that involved some verbal communication. W.16. stated that she does not remember the details of what happened, although it probably occurred in his office. She said she avoided him after that. W.16. indicated that she had told her friend I.N. that she was uncomfortable about Manweller. W.16. said that I.N. shared with her that she also had concerns about him.

Manweller failed to identify any motive for I.N., W.15., or W.16. to make false statements, and he did not clearly deny the claims or contend that the alleged behavior was not possible. Neither did the investigation reveal that I.N. had anything to gain by fabricating a complaint.

Moreover, I.N. offered a plausible account with similarities to allegations of other female students and former students. For example, six other women described inappropriate conduct by Manweller that occurred in his office.

14. Finding: Interviewee O

The evidence gathered demonstrated that it was more likely than not that Manweller subjected I.O. to unwelcome attention during the winter quarter of 2005. Specifically, the information supported a finding that he asked her personal questions in his office, made her feel uncomfortable, and complimented her voice, telling her that he would never forget a voice like hers. She experienced the behavior as creepy and never took a class from Manweller again. In reaching this finding, the following information was considered.

As detailed in Section IV.N, in December 2017 and January 2018 communications about I.O.'s concerns about Manweller (i.e., with the University, on Facebook, and with this investigator), there was some variation in I.O.'s representations about the number of times she met with Manweller in his office, the number of times he told her he liked her voice, and the number of messages she wrote to complain. Specifically, I.O.'s email to the University mentioned going to Manweller's office multiple times and said he "often" told her he liked her voice and would never forget a voice like hers. And in a Facebook post dated December 8, 2017, I.O. stated that she "wrote emails [plural] complaining about him" and nothing was done. When interviewed for this investigation, I.O. was very specific, describing one time when she went to his office and he made the comments about her voice. She also stated that she recalled sending an email about her concerns to someone at the University, although she does not remember who it was.

When information gathered for an investigation reflects that someone has made inconsistent statements, it is appropriate to assess whether there are potential credibility issues. In this case, I.O. was not initially consistent on how many times she went to Manweller's office, how many times he said he liked her voice, or how many emails she wrote about him. Nevertheless, in her interview for this investigation, I.O. provided focused, specific information. She was consistent and credible on each of the material points: Manweller invited her to his office; instead of talking about the class, he asked her questions about herself; he complimented her voice; and he told her he would never forget a voice like hers. In this case, the minor inconsistencies did not meaningfully detract from the critical information she offered.

When interviewed for this investigation, Manweller stated that he did remember I.O. but not the conversation. Manweller stated that he had no recollection of saying that I.O. has a distinctive voice. Manweller did not exclude the possibility that he may have complimented I.O.'s voice and told her it was a voice he would never forget.

Manweller did not identify any motive for I.O. to fabricate a claim against him, and the investigation did not reveal anything I.O. had to gain from making a false report.

Support for the plausibility of I.O.'s account came from similarities with other information gathered. By illustration, six other women reported that Manweller gave them compliments

based on physical characteristics and six other women described Manweller acting inappropriately in his office.

15. Finding: Interviewee P

A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that Manweller engaged in the conduct alleged by I.P., a CWU student from 2008-12:

- During the summer quarter of 2009, one day he sent her a text telling her that she should not wear the top she had on that day in class because it had been distracting him. He would not have had a basis to make such a comment if he had not been looking at how her body looked in the top.
- Manweller also made an inappropriate comment to her in his office sometime later. After she made a joke about jobs being available at Arby's, Manweller then said: "You better close the door so no one can hear you scream when I spank you."
- I.P. found the behavior inappropriate and reported feeling weirded out and uncomfortable.

The information from I.P. was obtained following Manweller's interview for this investigation. He was provided with the information obtained from I.P. but did not offer a response prior to the date of this investigation report.

There was no indication of some motivation for I.P. to fabricate her claims, especially given that this investigator initiated contact with her.

I.P.'s information was plausible. The behavior – looking at her body, commenting on it, and making a statement with sexual overtones – had much in common with other information provided by I.A. – I.O.

16. Finding: Other Witness Information

Additional support for the findings for I.A. – I.P. was provided by several witnesses. These witnesses described first-hand observations of Manweller engaged in behavior similar to that experienced by I.A. – I. P.

a. Finding: Witness 22

The evidence supported a finding that it was more likely than not that Manweller looked at W.22.'s body. Specifically, the information gathered established that in the winter of 2012, there was an occasion when W.22.'s midriff had been showing slightly and she noticed Manweller looking at her body.

Although I.P., the person W.22. identified as a witness to this conduct, said she did not recall it, I.P. said that it was possible that it occurred. Information provided by W.22. placed I.P. in the same vicinity at the time; both took International Politics with Professor Otopalik that quarter,

and W.22. reported that they were waiting to go into the classroom when Manweller looked at her body.

The investigation did not reveal a motive to fabricate the information. Contact with W.22. for this investigation was initiated by this investigator, not W.22. She emphasized that she expected to be working with Manweller in the future, after she returned to her lobbying work. During her interview, rather than presenting the incident as a complaint, W.22. mentioned it in the course of explaining the context of when she had understood I.P. to be warning her about Manweller.

Further support for this finding came from the similarities with other information gathered. As detailed in the discussion above, eight other women's accounts included Manweller looking at their bodies.

Manweller was provided with a detailed written description of the information shared by W.22. but did not offer a response.

b. Finding: Witness 19

A preponderance of the evidence supported a finding that in 2006 Manweller bought drinks for W.19. and her friend [from the 2013 investigation] at the Starlight, acted flirty, talked about sex, and asked her friend personal questions.

In the current investigation, Manweller declined to comment on the information from W.19. He also declined to be interviewed for the 2013 investigation and did not respond to W.19.'s information at that time either.

The investigation did not identify any motive for W.19. to fabricate claims. The information W.19. provided was consistent with the information the investigator in the 2013 investigation described receiving from her.

Additionally, the conduct in question was similar to Manweller's behavior described by various other women in this investigation, i.e., talking about sex, buying drinks, acting flirtatious, and asking inappropriate personal questions.

c. Finding: Witness 17

The information gathered in the investigation showed that it was more likely than not that in 2005 W.17. observed Manweller making comments about the appearance of female students but not similarly complimenting the male students' appearance. This was consistent with other information gathered in the investigation revealing that Manweller complimented physical characteristics of seven female students and former students. Manweller declined to offer a response to W.17.'s information.

d. Finding: Witness 18

The investigation established that it was more likely than not that Manweller flirted with female students and would drink with them at local establishments, as claimed by W.18. She indicated

that she took multiple classes from Manweller, including the same class in which W.17. was enrolled in the spring of 2005. According to W.18., flirting was the way he acted, and it was not unusual to see Manweller out at The Tav with female students. When asked about the information from W.18., Manweller asserted that W.18. had been best friends with I.K. at the time, but he offered no other response.

e. Finding: Witness 20 and Witness 21

A preponderance of the evidence established that (1) W.20. observed Manweller compliment the appearance of a female student employee, W.21., and show her extra attention and (2) W.21. did not feel uncomfortable with Manweller.

W.20. is the former secretary at the Political Science Department, where she worked from December 2014 until September 2017 and supervised the all-female student employees. W.20. reported that she observed that Manweller took a keen interest in one of the female student employees, W.21., who worked there from early 2016 until her graduation in 2017. According to W.20., Manweller would pay attention to what W.21. wore and her hair and complimented her appearance. W.20. described Manweller as having a radiant smile when he would see W.21. and said he would try to engage her in conversations about her interests. W.20. said she found this behavior creepy. W.20's report was plausible, as Manweller complimenting physical characteristics was raised by seven women in this investigation.

At the same time, when interviewed, W.21 said she thought Manweller was really nice and did not feel uncomfortable around him. She gave no indication of attention from Manweller that she experienced as unwelcome.

When interviewed, W.20. also talked about feeling that she needed to tell the female student employees about the allegations against Manweller, instruct them not to go into his office alone, and ask them to please let her know if they felt uncomfortable with him. In his interview, Manweller acknowledged that he knows W.20. from when she was the Department secretary. He stated that her information was in some ways enlightening: she was looking for something wrong, because she was told there was something wrong. He indicated that W.20. had been instructed; when asked by whom, he indicated that he did not know. W.20. stated that no one asked her to take this approach with the female students in regard to Manweller.

VI. CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, a preponderance of the evidence established that Dr. Manweller engaged in a pattern of unprofessional and inappropriate behavior with gender-based and sexual overtones with female students and former students from 2004 to 2017.

CONFIDENTIAL

Interviewee A = [1] FERPA

Video: <https://www.tvw.org/watch/?eventID=2017031319> See 27:00-28:00

Interviewee B = [1] FERPA

Interviewee C = [1] FERPA

Interviewee D = [1] FERPA

Interviewee E = [1] FERPA

Interviewee F = [1] FERPA

Interviewee G = [1] FERPA

Interviewee H = [1] FERPA

Interviewee I = [1] FERPA

Interviewee J = *confidential*

Interviewee K = [1] FERPA

Interviewee L = [1] FERPA

Interviewee M = [1] FERPA

Interviewee N = [1] FERPA

Interviewee O = [1] FERPA

Interviewee P = [1] FERPA

CONFIDENTIAL

Witness 1 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 2 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 3 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 4 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 5 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 6 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 7 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 8 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 9 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 10 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 11 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 12 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 13 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 14 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 15 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 16 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 17 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 18 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 19 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 20 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 21 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 22 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 23 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 24 = [1] FERPA [REDACTED]

Witness 25 = [1] FERPA

Witness 26 = [1] FERPA