

Fall 2010: Began asking Ms. Dibbern questions about GEO. Ms. Dibbern informed Goldman of her position as GSI steward. Goldman stated union was okay for GSIs but not RAs. Goldman said RA unionization was a terrible idea with which no one should be involved.

October/November 2010: Goldman began asking specifically about RA organizing campaign in one-on-one meetings, stating categorically that a union was bad and reiterating that she couldn't understand why anyone would get involved. She claimed to be trying to protect her students from the union.

February 2011: Goldman again asked detailed questions about "union stuff." Asked why the "union" was running this campaign, who was involved, etc. Goldman said she couldn't "understand why RA's would think this was a good idea."

June 2011: Discussion of formal review process requested by Rackham, followed one week later by one-on-one meetings explaining she would not be conducting such reviews. Goldman explained that all such reviews must be stopped across the dept. as they would be used by the union to arbitrarily fire graduate students. She stated Dibbern was a good employee and asked for understanding in canceling the reviews because she was "happy with everyone working for [her]" and didn't have any substantive critiques of anyone in her group. Goldman said she wanted to "protect the jobs of [her] students, not have them replaced by the union with other people who weren't as qualified but maybe had a PhD already." Goldman said she instructed all other professors who'd completed reviews to either "take them home where the union couldn't get them or burn them."

June 28: University emails sent out stating opposition to RA unionization.

July 19th: Ms. Dibbern attended CoE informational session on the RA campaign. She sat with Goldman and another professor. Ms. Dibbern asked a question after Goldman left, yet Goldman questioned Ms. Dibbern about this at a later date, indicating the other Professor had reported back to Goldman about Ms. Dibbern's behavior at the meeting. She repeatedly asked why Dibbern had attended, why she had asked a question, and how she felt about the response. She then stated that there were things she probably couldn't say without getting at the wrong end of a lawsuit but, since the University hadn't made what couldn't be said specifically clear yet, she wanted to make it clear that she thought unionization was a bad idea.

Goldman asked if Dibbern had seen the annarbor.com op-ed and described a conversation with another MSE professor who told Goldman "What are you doing? Your student is out of control; you better get a handle on her." To which Goldman said she replied, "She's not my problem anymore, she isn't in my group anymore--her new advisor has to deal with her."

August 1: Ms. Dibbern ran into Goldman outside of the Physics informational session. Goldman again questioned Ms. Dibbern as to why she was there.

August 5: In an individual meeting (called to discuss data) Goldman stated that she wanted to go to the MERC hearing Monday as she feared the union would ruin grad education at U of M. She relayed conversations she had with graduate students who were involved in the No Campaign. In the conversation, she referenced the consent agreement reached between GEO and the University regarding terms of election and said she was following the situation "very closely." She then stated Ms. Dibbern had more data than they could review in that meeting and that they would discuss it the following week.

August 8: At a 10am individual meeting, Goldman reviewed the GEO website and spoke about it with Ms. Dibbern. She stated that the MERC meeting will determine whether "we have a research university left." She stated she would leave if the union was formed.

August 8: Goldman sent Ms. Dibbern an email that, for the first time, questioned the progress she was making on research and instructed her to stop all outside activity to demonstrate her commitment to her research.

August 10: Goldman repeatedly instructed Ms. Dibbern to stop all outside activity, this time in person. When Ms. Dibbern asked for clarification, Goldman stated, "you know what I mean."

August 13: Goldman sent Ms. Dibbern an email "formalizing" the situation: No future funding unless there was extraordinary improvement in her work progress. This is the first time Goldman included an outside party in any form of disciplinary communication.

August 30: Goldman emailed Ms. Dibbern stating she would not provide research funds beyond Fall 2011 term thereby violating the department policy for termination of a GSRA.