

Appendix H

Timeline

Timeline - Investigative Committee

Legend: JJ = Janine Janosky, KF = Kirsty Fleming, EJ = Eileen Jennings, DL = Doug Lapp, LD = Lisa DeMeyer, KWS = Ken Smith, CL = Carl Lee, DSJ = Denny St. John, CVE = Chuck VonderEmbse, AM = Azita Manouchehri, GS = Gary Shapiro, WO = Wayne Osborn, BK = Bob Kohrman, JA = Jim Angelos, PE = Pam Eddy, J O-L = Justin Oh-Lee, CR = Craig Reynolds, [REDACTED] DA = Donna Ahlers.

March 7, 2008: LD went to ORSP to verify the materials she had submitted and to sign assurances.

March 5, 2008: DL went to ORSP to verify the materials he had submitted and to sign assurances.

February 28, 2008: Meeting with PE and J O-L regarding final report and tasks that need to be completed prior to finalising the report.

February 27, 2008: Meeting with PE regarding final report and tasks that need to be completed prior to finalising the report.

January 26, 2008: Committee requests, via JJ, materials designed to help verify information received to date.

January 22 – 25, 2008: KF visit to CMU. Committee meetings.

January 21, 2008: DL received e-mail message from RB indicating that the IRB associated with the CONCEPT project has been put on hold. A consequence is that all research (including a graduate student's thesis work) associated with the project must cease.

January 17, 2008: Interview with KWS; Chair of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at Sam Houston State University. Co-PI on the CONCEPT project.

January 16, 2008: Interview with CL, Professor of Statistics in the Department of Mathematics at CMU. Senior Personnel on the CONCEPT project.

January 15, 2008: Interview with DSJ, Professor of Mathematics Education in the Department of Mathematics at CMU. Co-PI on the CONCEPT project.

January 10, 2008: Interview with CVE, Professor of Mathematics Education in the Department of Mathematics at CMU. Co-PI on the CONCEPT project.

January 3, 2008: KF received e-mail message from KWS.

December 15, 2007: Committee requests, via JJ, materials (course packet, syllabus, timeline, class list) designed to help verify information received to date.

December 14, 2007: AM informed by JJ that deadline has been extended to April 13, 2008.

December 13, 2007: Committee discussion by phone to discuss AM requests (see December 12 note). JJ informed committee that an investigation will be launched into the integrity of the proposal itself (the initial issue of plagiarism in the proposal was raised by the NSF). The allegations are being levied against DL and AM.

December 12, 2007: Interview with Mathematics Educator not at CMU regarding disciplines norms in the development of curricula materials. GS granted the request for an extension of the CMU deadline.

December 11, 2007: Extension of deadline request made by KF to JJ. Specifically requested that CMU deadline be extended to match NSF deadline (April 13, 2008).

December 10, 2007: Committee meeting, interview with Mathematics Educator not at CMU regarding disciplines norms in the development of curricula materials. Discussion with EJ (topics: intent of accusation as a factor and impact of technicalities on outcomes).

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

December 7, 2007: Interviews with JA (chair of the Department of Mathematics until July 2007), WO (Interim Vice Provost, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs until August 2007) and BK (Dean of the College of Science and Technology, until January 2008).

November 30, 2007: Committee requests, via JJ, that JA, BK, LD and AM each provide a copy, if they have one, of the course materials actually used in class in spring 2007. Also a request that DL provide a timeline.

November 29, 2007: Committee meeting.

November 14, 2007: Interview with Mathematics Educator not at CMU regarding disciplines norms in the development of curricula materials.

November 13, 2007: Committee meeting with NSF (included EJ and RB), interview with AM (now at OSU, Professor of Mathematics Education in the School of Teaching and Learning at the Ohio State University. Co-PI on the CONCEPT project).

November 6, 2007: Interview with LD (Assistant Professor of Mathematics in the Department of Mathematics. Senior Personnel on the CONCEPT project at CMU).

November 6, 2007: AM was notified that a meeting had been scheduled for November 13, 2007.

November 5, 2007: Interview with DL (Professor of Mathematics in the Department of Mathematics at CMU. PI on the CONCEPT project at CMU).

October 23, 2007: Letter from JJ to PE, KF and J O-L re NSF issues and procedures.

October 2, 2007: Initial phone conversation between JJ and KF.

September 24, 2007:

i) GS informed AM, via e-mail, that an investigation would be undertaken.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

Legend: JJ = Janine Janosky, KF = Kirsty Fleming, EJ = Eileen Jennings, DL = Doug Lapp, LD = Lisa DeMeyer, KWS = Ken Smith, CL = Carl Lee, DSJ = Denny St. John, CVE = Chuck VonderEmbse, AM = Azita Manouchehri, GS = Gary Shapiro, WO = Wayne Osborn, BK = Bob Kohrman, JA = Jim Angelos, PE = Pam Eddy, J O-L = Justin Oh-Lee, CR = Craig Reynolds, [REDACTED] DA = Donna Ahlers.

March 7, 2008: LD went to ORSP to verify the materials she had submitted and to sign assurances.

March 5, 2008: AM message sent to JJ. AM indicates MATH 362 syllabus was included in materials she bought to November 13, 2007 meeting. PE and KF had both reviewed the materials and did not see the syllabus. PE double-checked the materials and was still unable to locate the syllabus.

March 5, 2008: DL went to ORSP to verify the materials he had submitted and to sign assurances.

February 28, 2008: Meeting with PE and J O-L regarding final report and tasks that need to be completed prior to finalising the report.

February 27, 2008: Meeting with PE regarding final report and tasks that need to be completed prior to finalising the report.

January 26, 2008: Committee requests, via JJ, materials designed to help verify information received to date.

January 23, 2008: AM message sent to JJ, copied were PE, KF and J O-L. The message outlines a number of concerns that AM has about the process and the impact on her. She expresses concerns about what she deems to be a mishandling of the situation on the part of CMU. She lists several questions to which she wants answers prior to appearing before the committee.

January 23, 2008: AM sends e-mail message to JJ. From message "I relinquish all rights to CONCEPT, grant funded to CMU through NSF (PI: Doug Lapp), on which I served as a Co-PI from June 2005-July 2007.

January 22 – 25, 2008: KF visit to CMU. Committee meetings.

January 21, 2008: DL received e-mail message from RB indicating that the IRB associated with the CONCEPT project has been put on hold. A consequence is that all research (including a graduate student's thesis work) associated with the project must cease.

January 17, 2008: Interview with KWS; Chair of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics at Sam Houston State University. Co-PI on the CONCEPT project.

January 16, 2008: Interview with CL, Professor of Statistics in the Department of Mathematics at CMU. Senior Personnel on the CONCEPT project.

January 15, 2008: Interview with DSJ, Professor of Mathematics Education in the Department of Mathematics at CMU. Co-PI on the CONCEPT project.

January 10, 2008: Interview with CVE, Professor of Mathematics Education in the Department of Mathematics at CMU. Co-PI on the CONCEPT project.

January 3, 2008: KF received e-mail message from KWS.

December 15, 2007: Committee requests, via JJ, materials (course packet, syllabus, timeline, class list) designed to help verify information received to date.

December 14, 2007: AM informed by JJ that deadline has been extended to April 13, 2008.

December 13, 2007: Committee discussion by phone to discuss AM requests (see December 12 note). JJ informed committee that an investigation will be launched into

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

the integrity of the proposal itself (the initial issue of plagiarism in the proposal was raised by the NSF). The allegations are being levied against DL and AM.

December 12, 2007: Interview with Mathematics Educator not at CMU regarding disciplines norms in the development of curricula materials. GS granted the request for an extension of the CMU deadline.

December 11, 2007: Extension of deadline request made by KF to JJ. Specifically requested that CMU deadline be extended to match NSF deadline (April 13, 2008).

December 11, 2007: E-mail messages from AM, via JJ. AM indicates that she does not have a copy of the materials that were used in the class in spring 2007 (no explanation given). AM requests that JJ send copies of all electronic materials that were sent by her to the committee by JJ be sent back to her (purpose to determine if all the information got through to the committee, concerned that e-mail glitch may have resulted in the loss of some information). AM asked for update on her requests that the committee interview KWS, CL, WO and 11 faculty members in the Department of Mathematics (see December 3, 2007). AM also requested that she be given the protocol she should use for directly contacting the committee members.

December 10, 2007: Committee meeting, interview with Mathematics Educator not at CMU regarding disciplines norms in the development of curricula materials. Discussion with EJ (topics: intent of accusation as a factor and impact of technicalities on outcomes).

December 7, 2007: Interviews with JA (chair of the Department of Mathematics until July 2007), WO (Interim Vice Provost, Office of Research and Sponsored Programs until August 2007) and BK (Dean of the College of Science and Technology, until January 2008).

December 4, 2007: E-mail message from AM, via JJ. Message asks that the committee review email from WO to AM (27 July 2007, Subject RE: CONCEPT Grant) and the email from AM to JA and DL (27 July 2007, Subject copies).

These messages have been reviewed.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

December 3, 2007: E-mail message from AM, via JJ. Again requests that committee interview CL, KWS and WO (latter already scheduled, first two to be discussed at December 10, 2007 meeting). Also lists eleven individual who should be interviewed to get the "... individuals' perspectives on Lapp's accusations...".

November 30, 2007: Committee requests, via JJ, that JA, BK, LD and AM each provide a copy, if they have one, of the course materials actually used in class in spring 2007. Also a request that DL provide a timeline.

November 29, 2007: Committee meeting.

November 27, 2007: E-mail message from AM, via JJ. Issue raised on intellectual property. Specifically pre-existing material developed by AM and used on CONCEPT.

November 26, 2007: E-mail message from JJ regarding phone conversation with AM. AM is requesting that we interview CL, KWS and WO. The request, at least for KWS, was made earlier (see November 20 e-mail message from AM entitled "name of individual to be interviewed"). Added information from AM was providing a rationale for our interviewing each of these people.

November 20, 2007: E-mail message from AM via JJ. Request that we interview KWS.

November 14, 2007: Interview with Mathematics Educator not at CMU regarding disciplines norms in the development of curricula materials.

November 13, 2007: E-mail message from DL via JJ indicating that additional data related to the project had been found.

November 13, 2007: Committee meeting with NSF (included EJ and RB), interview with AM (now at OSU, Professor of Mathematics Education in the School of Teaching and Learning at the Ohio State University. Co-PI on the CONCEPT project).

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

November 13, 2007: E-mail message from AM via JJ. Contains timeline information and some information about project related responsibilities.

November 6, 2007: Interview with LD (Assistant Professor of Mathematics in the Department of Mathematics. Senior Personnel on the CONCEPT project at CMU).

November 6, 2007: AM was notified that a meeting had been scheduled for November 13, 2007.

November 5, 2007: Interview with DL (Professor of Mathematics in the Department of Mathematics at CMU. PI on the CONCEPT project at CMU).

November 5, 2007: AM contacted NSF. AM was told [by whom?] that there was no reason for her not to contact NSF to inform them of the status of the project (see November 13, 2007 e-mail message from AM forwarded by JJ).

November 3/4, 2007: AM bombarded [her word] JJ with e-mail message and additional data she felt would be helpful to the committee. She wrote to JJ wanting reassurance that she would not be excluded from the investigation and that communications she had with JJ and GS would be shared with the committee members. AM mentioned to JJ that she could be on campus for a visit.

November 3, 2007: AM message via JJ. Points made by AM:

1) Based on information sent to the NSF concluded that NSF had not (but should have been) notified sooner.

2) Requested that all communication regarding CONCEPT which she had with JJ and GS be relayed to the NSF officer in charge of investigation. Wanted committee, along with the NSF committee to investigate why no mention of WO's concerns were mentioned in what was communicated with NSF.

3) Stated LD, did nothing for the responsibility she was assigned and received course release for a year. AM stated that LD concurs with the previous statement. Wanted to Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

know...what is NSF's stand on this issue? Also wanted to know the opinion of CMU's personnel committee and Dean Kohrman's office.

4) Stated DL had course release to assist with data collection. "To his own accord he did nothing to assist in the process." AM wanted us to establish what DL did as the PI of the project to facilitate the life of this grant.

5) AM understood that CVE is being given a course release (supported by NSF) this year. Wanted to know what he would be doing and who made the decision to include him? Wanted to know if NSF ever notified that he was not a part of this project [does this relate to CVE's leave of absence?].

6) Requested that materials from other courses be collected and examined (MTH 363 explicitly mentioned).

November 2, 2007: Materials were sent to JJ's office (inventory given in November 2 2007 message). AM requested that materials for MATH 261 and 363 be examined by the committee.

October 29, 2007: AM received the request for submission of materials. AM learned that she was to be "put on trial" rather than the promise she was made about examining the project capacity. AM called JJ to learn about what she needed to send to her office.

October 23, 2007: Letter from JJ to PE, KF and J O-L re NSF issues and procedures.

October 4, 2007: AM wrote to JJ and GS informing them that she would be out of town most of October and provided phone contact information.

October 2, 2007: Initial phone conversation between JJ and KF.

September 24, 2007:

- i) GS informed AM, via e-mail, that an investigation would be undertaken.
- ii) DL sends memo to JJ related to missing data.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

September 17, 2007: AM e-mail message to GS (JJ copied). "It should have been clear to Doug Lapp if not dean Kohrman, that even if there were flaws in the materials I had developed we still had three years to fix those flaws. Scanning the materials will clarify that the content is bullet proof. This does not mean that the problems are new; this does not mean that the content is ground breaking or earth-shattering; no such promise was made to the NSF.... Lots is yet left to be done". AM writes "I wrote this grant". Also "Had I chosen to wait a year until I met the immigration status requirement of the NSF for Pling CONCEPT someone else's name would not have appeared as the PI of the project".

September 11, 2007: AM wrote to JA (Cced to GS and JJ) and asked that the copy of materials she had left in the office be delivered to GS's office. AM was concerned that the materials in their final form were not submitted to, or viewed by, WO.

September 10 and 17, 2007: AM wrote GS two messages in which she outlined both the history of the grant and the extent of her involvement in it. She outlined the circumstances surrounding the accusations. She listed a few issues that needed to be addressed by the project PI regarding her elimination from the project. She asked that a committee be assembled to examine the issue. This message contains text supporting the idea that AM believed that materials in draft were held to different (more relaxed) standards than those in final form. AM also mentions that materials were amended (just in time) during the semester that the course was taught not just at the end of the semester. AM wrote as a reaction to the allegations, "I was using other people's materials without citing them. This was all so sudden. Lisa was in my class only the day before... Neither one of them (LD and DL) seemed to understand that the material used in the pilot course was not for public use or open to release." [definition of public?]. Note also the following [occurred in the spring?], "Doug felt that in order to put the matter behind us and to protect this project, it would be best to put samples of our materials on webpage. I agreed with his suggestion and provided him with an electronic version of the text that was still a work in progress."

September 10, 2007: AM first wrote an e-mail and then contacted WO to ask about the report sent to her. According to AM:

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

WO mentioned that he felt the motivation behind the insinuations was to keep the grant funds on campus.

WO expressed concerns about the project staff being able to complete duties without her involvement.

WO suggested that by proposing that an investigation be made this issue would have to be examined.

WO informed AM that since BK was retiring in December 2007 and that he too was retiring he felt by requesting an investigation be made the matter would be looked into before he left office.

WO was concerned that AM had been deliberately excluded from any conversation regarding the grant.

WO suggested that AM write to GS and provide the history and context of CONCEPT and her project related activities.

September 10, 2007: E-mail message from WO to BM re phone conversation with AM.

September 8, 2007: AM received a letter from WO's office indicating that he was recommending an investigation be undertaken. The document WO submitted included summaries of interviews with different individuals in the department [of mathematics]. AM believed that the line of inquiry surrounded whether she was difficult to work with and her reasons for leaving CMU.

August 28, 2007: WO sent AM a letter informing her that the inquiry phase was completed and that he was recommending that an investigation be initiated. WO sent GS a memo to the same effect.

August 20, 2007: WO talked to DSJ.

August 17, 2007: WO talked to CVE. CVE had not seen any of the materials in question. He returned, to the department office, the materials that were given to him without opening them.

August 16, 2007: AM received an e-mail from KWS and learned that WO had contacted him and asked questions about the grant.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

August 14, 2007: WO contacted DA to ask about the materials that had been left by AM. Two sets were left one for DL and one for CVE. DA had neither of them. WO also talked to RJF and KWS.

August 13, 2007: WO talked to DL. Updated him on the status of the issue, informed him of decision related to subcontract, stressed need for confidentiality. DL confirmed that AM's role in the project was as she described.

August 1, 2007: Informal talk between BK and WO re status of issue. WO informed JA that AM would not receive a subcontract and that AM had been informed of this fact.

July 26, 2007: WO met with LD. LD expressed concerns about the integrity of AM's work. A formal complaint was not made. CR reported to WO on the results of his conversation with AM.

July 27, 2007: WO talked to AM. Informed her of the concerns that had been expressed. AM was to send an e-mail message detailing her role in the project. See message dated July 27, 2007. Not clear that a decision had been made to initiate an inquiry. If decision had been made it was not clear that this was communicated to AM.

July 27, 2007: AM contacted WO via e-mail first. WO asked that she contact him by phone to explain why the decision was made that subcontracting the grant not be approved by his office. AM learned that during the meeting WO had with BK and DL it was suggested to him that subcontracting should not happen: BK had, according to WO, stated that people in the mathematics department did not know how to work with each other. Second one of them had suggested that the authenticity of the materials AM had developed needed to be investigated, that had AM plagiarized resources in creating the text. WO concluded at the end of his conversation with AM that subcontracting the grant was not a good idea and that CR would be in touch with DL and AM about the plans. AM was asked to honor confidentiality and not contact NSF till the issue was resolved internally. AM asked that WO to examine her materials and check for authenticity.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

AM requested that JA make copies of materials she had submitted and keep them on file. She was not told what to do or how to proceed. She assumed the deal was that she would be notified about what [when] she could contact the NSF. E-mail message includes a list of AM's project related responsibilities.

July 26, 2007: AM contacted CR to learn about any decisions made regarding her involvement in the project. She mentioned to him that she was leaving town on the 27th and needed to learn of her responsibilities to the grant.

July 23, 2007: AM had a phone conversation with CR. AM was notified by CR that a meeting with WO had taken place to discuss the subcontracting of the funds. The meeting was requested by BK and DL. CR did not know what the meeting was about and was, according to AM, surprised that AM was not asked to be present. AM was reassured that she would be notified of developments on the matter.

July 20, 2007: AM submitted copies of materials developed for MATH 362 to be distributed among the advisory board members. AM left a copy for CVE to use in his class during Fall 2006 [fall 2007?].

July 18/19, 2007: DL and AM exchanged e-mails regarding the upcoming advisory board. AM reassured DL that she would continue to carry her share of the responsibilities to the project.

July 17/18, 2007: AM's possessions were moved from Mt. Pleasant to Ohio.

July 13, 2007: AM asked DL to be notified of her responsibilities to the grant. DL responded that he was not the person to make decisions and that she needed to contact WO (e-mails were CCed to BK). AM explained to DL that decisions concerning the division of funds could not be made without input from both AM and DL (e-mails were CCed to BK).

July 13, 2007: BK received a resignation from AM effective July 27, 2007.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

July 11, 2007: DL and BK met with WO to discuss responsibilities on the CONCEPT project given that AM would be moving to OSU. Concerns were expressed about the integrity of AM's work. CR was asked to talk to AM.

July 11, 2007: AM notified CVE that she did not want him involved in the re-write of the materials she had developed. AM mentioned to CVE that while she did not know whether he was asked to do so or not he needed to know where she stood on the issue. Both DL and DSJ were also notified of AM's decisions regarding CVE's involvement.

July 11, 2007: AM e-mail to [REDACTED] (forwarded by JJ on November 4, 2007). AM informs [REDACTED] of work (surveys and interviews) that needed to be completed in 07-08. Instruments pertaining to the work were attached to the message.

July 10, 2007: AM was notified by JA that CVE was assigned to work on MATH 362. AM had not given permission for his involvement. AM indicated that these discussions and agreements had been made sometime in May/early June.

July 10, 2007: BK sent AM a letter turning down her request [for an LOA].

July 8, 2007: DL and AM met to discuss the division of labor issues during the upcoming years. It was agreed that funds would be divided. DL would lead the data collection. AM would be involved in data analysis, refining the instruments, participate in work with pilot visits; and re-writing the materials (362). AM mentioned to DL that she had asked for time off from OSU for the winter quarter to be on CMU campus for the piloting of 462 materials. AM and DL also agreed that AM would have funding for a graduate student to help with the rewrite of materials. AM proposed that she would work on transporting the new program to OSU. DL said that he would meet with CR and that he would contact OSU (he mentioned the name of someone he knew there). AM mentioned to him that she needed to be involved as well pointing out that she could have met with CR in June. DL mentioned that CVE would be teaching Math 362 in Spring and could participate in the re-write of the materials for the course. AM objected to the suggestion and communicated her reservations about giving the materials she had spent a year and half to develop to someone else.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

July 8, 2007: BK received through JA a request from AM for a leave of absence.

June 18, 2007: AM contacted CR and asked for a time to meet. AM mentioned to CR that she wanted to wait till DL was back from summer vacation.

June 2007: AM notified DL of her plans to move to OSU. AM and DL discussed plans for summer workshops and organizing sessions for pilot sites representatives. AM announced her departure from CMU and requested a leave of absence.

May, June 2007: BK had no other scheduled meetings with LD, DL or AM.

May 2007: AM agreed to lead a graduate student's MA thesis with the understanding that the student would assist with the data collection and analysis. DL was notified.

April 9, 2007: BK had a meeting with LD. BK stated that he believed that this meeting had nothing to do with the research misconduct issues but related to an RP&T issue. JA may have been at the meeting. BK stated that the RP&T issue and the research misconduct issue were not related.

April 4, 2007: AM learned that DL and LD had retrieved the course materials from the students in MTH 362.

April 3, 2007: BK met with DL and LD. This meeting, according to BK, "... probably set the stage for trying to retrieve all of the workbooks/handouts."

April 3?, 2007: DL asked that project materials be put on the webpage as a way to protect the materials. AM mentioned to him that it was too soon since the materials were still being revised. According to AM she submitted materials, in electronic form, to DL. DL and AM agreed that they would read each other's work and provide feedback.

March 31, 2007: AM left town for a meeting. AM sent DL a message (forwarded to us by JJ on November 4). AM's note indicates that the message confirms that DL was in

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

possession of CD's for two interviews. The actual message indicates "I am putting a copy of one or two of the interviews in your mailbox."

March 29, 2007: AM was notified by JA that he had spoken with the dean and that the matter was resolved. AM asked JA (and submitted to him the complete package of materials) that he continue reading the materials and provide feedback on what needed to be changed, particularly what needed to be referenced.

March 28, 2007 (or perhaps earlier): BK met with LD. BK states that "It appears that I may have met with Lisa DeMeyer on or just before March 28. (She does not appear on my calendar book), but I have an email from AM that complains about her and Jim meeting with me." BK does not recall JA being at the meeting but he may have been there. AM, in her e-mail message to BK also states that she wanted to meet with BK, but she never did request a meeting. A possible reason that the meeting is not on BK's calendar is that probably LD (& JA) may have come over on the spur of the moment.

March 26-28?, 2007: LD and JA met with BK during which LD had mentioned that AM had used materials without the permission of authors. It was AM's understanding that LD's promotion file was denied and that LD had organized a meeting with BK to discuss her case. AM became aware of the meeting on the 28th through JA. He came by AM's office to apologize and to mention that he had over-reacted without looking carefully at what was being done. He casually mentioned that he and LD had gone to the dean and talked to him.

Spring 2006 [should be spring 2007 KF]: Pilot class-Materials were being piloted, revised, re-written, and new activities were being developed.

Summer 2006: Initial analysis of data. Meeting with the advisory board (August 2006). Upon the advisory board's recommendation for the need for collecting interview data and revising the conceptual test AM worked on these two agendas as well.

Spring 2006: "devoted to studying the literature, developing Module II and III activities, deciding what to use from high school textbooks, building a tentative curriculum materials to be piloted in Spring 2007".

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

January 2006: AM began to work on development of MATH 362 with LD.

December 2005: AM was notified by CVE that the MATH 362 writing team had not worked on the development of materials. CVE announced that he was unable to devote time to project

May 8, 2005: DL e-mail to BK indicating he and AM were equal partners in the CONCEPT project.

May 2005: Announcement of approval of funding for CONCEPT project.

Timeline – Bob Kohrman

Legend: JJ = Janine Janosky, KF = Kirsty Fleming, EJ = Eileen Jennings, DL = Doug Lapp, LD = Lisa DeMeyer, KWS = Ken Smith, CL = Carl Lee, DSJ = Denny St. John, CVE = Chuck VonderEmbse, AM = Azita Manouchehri, GS = Gary Shapiro, WO = Wayne Osborn, BK = Bob Kohrman, JA = Jim Angelos, PE = Pam Eddy, J O-L = Justin Oh-Lee, CR = Craig Reynolds, [REDACTED] DA = Donna Ahlers.

July 13, 2007: BK received a resignation from AM effective July 27, 2007.

July 10, 2007: BK sent AM a letter turning down her request [for an LOA].

July 8, 2007: BK received through JA a request from AM for a leave of absence.

May, June 2007: BK had no other scheduled meetings with LD, DL or AM.

April 9, 2007: BK had a meeting with LD. BK stated that he believed that this meeting had nothing to do with the research misconduct issues but related to an RP&T issue. JA may have been at the meeting. BK stated that the RP&T issue and the research misconduct issue were not related.

April 3, 2007: BK met with DL and LD. This meeting, according to BK, "... probably set the stage for trying to retrieve all of the workbooks/handouts."

March 28, 2007 (or perhaps earlier): BK met with LD. BK states that "It appears that I may have met with Lisa DeMeyer on or just before March 28. (She does not appear on my calendar book), but I have an email from AM that complains about her and Jim meeting with me." BK does not recall JA being at the meeting but he may have been there. AM, in her e-mail message to BK also states that she wanted to meet with BK, but she never did request a meeting. A possible reason that the meeting is not on BK's calendar is that probably LD (& JA) may have come over on the spur of the moment.

Timeline – Wayne Osborn

Legend: JJ = Janine Janosky, KF = Kirsty Fleming, EJ = Eileen Jennings, DL = Doug Lapp, LD = Lisa DeMeyer, KWS = Ken Smith, CL = Carl Lee, DSJ = Denny St. John, CVE = Chuck VonderEmbse, AM = Azita Manouchehri, GS = Gary Shapiro, WO = Wayne Osborn, BK = Bob Kohrman, JA = Jim Angelos, PE = Pam Eddy, J O-L = Justin Oh-Lee, CR = Craig Reynolds, [REDACTED] DA = Donna Ahlers.

September 10, 2007: E-mail message from WO to BM re phone conversation with AM.

August 28, 2007: WO sent AM a letter informing her that the inquiry phase was completed and that he was recommending that an investigation be initiated. WO sent GS a memo to the same effect.

August 20, 2007: WO talked to DSJ.

August 17, 2007: WO talked to CVE. CVE had not seen any of the materials in question. He returned, to the department office, the materials that were given to him without opening them.

August 14, 2007: WO contacted DA to ask about the materials that had been left by AM. Two sets were left one for DL and one for CVE. DA had neither of them. WO also talked to RJF and KWS.

August 13, 2007: WO talked to DL. Updated him on the status of the issue, informed him of decision related to subcontract, stressed need for confidentiality. DL confirmed that AM's role in the project was as she described.

August 1, 2007: Informal talk between BK and WO re status of issue. WO informed JA that AM would not receive a subcontract and that AM had been informed of this fact.

July 26, 2007: WO met with LD. LD expressed concerns about the integrity of AM's work. A formal complaint was not made. CR reported to WO on the results of his conversation with AM.

July 27, 2007: WO talked to AM. Informed her of the concerns that had been expressed. AM was to send an e-mail message detailing her role in the project. See message dated July 27, 2007. Not clear that a decision had been made to initiate an inquiry. If decision had been made it was not clear that this was communicated to AM.

July 11, 2007: DL and BK met with WO to discuss responsibilities on the CONCEPT project given that AM would be moving to OSU. Concerns were expressed about the integrity of AM's work. CR was asked to talk to AM.

Timeline – Doug Lapp

Legend: JJ = Janine Janosky, KF = Kirsty Fleming, EJ = Eileen Jennings, DL = Doug Lapp, LD = Lisa DeMeyer, KWS = Ken Smith, CL = Carl Lee, DSJ = Denny St. John, CVE = Chuck VonderEmbse, AM = Azita Manouchehri, GS = Gary Shapiro, WO = Wayne Osborn, BK = Bob Kohrman, JA = Jim Angelos, PE = Pam Eddy, J O-L = Justin Oh-Lee, CR = Craig Reynolds, [REDACTED], DA = Donna Ahlers.

November 13, 2007: E-mail message from DL via JJ indicating that additional data related to the project had been found.

September 24, 2007:

ii) DL sends memo to JJ related to missing data.

May 8, 2005: DL e-mail to BK indicating he and AM were equal partners in the CONCEPT project.

Timeline – Azita Manouchehri

Legend: JJ = Janine Janosky, KF = Kirsty Fleming, EJ = Eileen Jennings, DL = Doug Lapp, LD = Lisa DeMeyer, KWS = Ken Smith, CL = Carl Lee, DSJ = Denny St. John, CVE = Chuck VonderEmbse, AM = Azita Manouchehri, GS = Gary Shapiro, WO = Wayne Osborn, BK = Bob Kohrman, JA = Jim Angelos, PE = Pam Eddy, J O-L = Justin Oh-Lee, CR = Craig Reynolds, [REDACTED] DA = Donna Ahlers.

March 5, 2008: AM message sent to JJ. AM indicates MATH 362 syllabus was included in materials she bought to November 13, 2007 meeting. PE and KF had both reviewed the materials and did not see the syllabus. PE double-checked the materials and was still unable to locate the syllabus.

January 23, 2008: AM message sent to JJ, copied were PE, KF and J O-L. The message outlines a number of concerns that AM has about the process and the impact on her. She expresses concerns about what she deems to be a mishandling of the situation on the part of CMU. She lists several questions to which she wants answers prior to appearing before the committee.

January 23, 2008: AM sends e-mail message to JJ. From message "I relinquish all rights to CONCEPT, grant funded to CMU through NSF (PI: Doug Lapp), on which I served as a Co-PI from June 2005-July 2007.

December 11, 2007: E-mail messages from AM, via JJ. AM indicates that she does not have a copy of the materials that were used in the class in spring 2007 (no explanation given). AM requests that JJ send copies of all electronic materials that were sent by her to the committee by JJ be sent back to her (purpose to determine if all the information got through to the committee, concerned that e-mail glitch may have resulted in the loss of some information). AM asked for update on her requests that the committee interview KWS, CL, WO and 11 faculty members in the Department of Mathematics (see December 3, 2007). AM also requested that she be given the protocol she should use for directly contacting the committee members.

December 4, 2007: E-mail message from AM, via JJ. Message asks that the committee review email from WO to AM (27 July 2007, Subject RE: CONCEPT Grant) and the email from AM to JA and DL (27 July 2007, Subject copies). These messages have been reviewed.

December 3, 2007: E-mail message from AM, via JJ. Again requests that committee interview CL, KWS and WO (latter already scheduled, first two to be discussed at December 10, 2007 meeting). Also lists eleven individual who should be interviewed to get the "... individuals' perspectives on Lapp's accusations...".

November 27, 2007: E-mail message from AM, via JJ. Issue raised on intellectual property. Specifically pre-existing material developed by AM and used on CONCEPT.

November 26, 2007: E-mail message from JJ regarding phone conversation with AM. AM is requesting that we interview CL, KWS and WO. The request, at least for KWS, was made earlier (see November 20 e-mail message from AM entitled "name of individual to be interviewed"). Added information from AM was providing a rationale for our interviewing each of these people.

November 20, 2007: E-mail message from AM via JJ. Request that we interview KWS.

November 13, 2007: E-mail message from AM via JJ. Contains timeline information and some information about project related responsibilities.

November 5, 2007: AM contacted NSF. AM was told [by whom?] that there was no reason for her not to contact NSF to inform them of the status of the project (see November 13, 2007 e-mail message from AM forwarded by JJ).

November 3, 2007: AM bombarded [her word] JJ with e-mail message and additional data she felt would be helpful to the committee. She wrote to JJ wanting reassurance that she would not be excluded from the investigation and that communications she had with JJ and GS would be shared with the committee members. AM mentioned to JJ that she could be on campus for a visit.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

November 3, 2007: AM message via JJ. Points made by AM:

1) Based on information sent to the NSF concluded that NSF had not (but should have been) notified sooner.

2) Requested that all communication regarding CONCEPT which she had with JJ and GS be relayed to the NSF officer in charge of investigation. Wanted committee, along with the NSF committee to investigate why no mention of WO's concerns were mentioned in what was communicated with NSF.

3) Stated LD, did nothing for the responsibility she was assigned and received course release for a year. AM stated that LD concurs with the previous statement. Wanted to know...what is NSF's stand on this issue? Also wanted to know the opinion of CMU's personnel committee and Dean Kohrman's office.

4) Stated DL had course release to assist with data collection. "To his own accord he did nothing to assist in the process." AM wanted us to establish what DL did as the PI of the project to facilitate the life of this grant.

5) AM understood that CVE is being given a course release (supported by NSF) this year. Wanted to know what he would be doing and who made the decision to include him? Wanted to know if NSF ever notified that he was not a part of this project [does this relate to CVE's leave of absence?].

6) Requested that materials from other courses be collected and examined (MTH 363 explicitly mentioned).

November 2, 2007: Materials were sent to JJ's office (inventory given in November 2 2007 message). AM requested that materials for MATH 261 and 363 be examined by the committee.

October 29, 2007: AM received the request for submission of materials. AM learned that she was to be "put on trial" rather than the promise she was made about examining the project capacity. AM called JJ to learn about what she needed to send to her office.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

October 4, 2007: AM wrote to JJ and GS informing them that she would be out of town most of October and provided phone contact information.

September 17, 2007: AM e-mail message to GS (JJ copied). "It should have been clear to Doug Lapp if not dean Kohrman, that even if there were flaws in the materials I had developed we still had three years to fix those flaws. Scanning the materials will clarify that the content is bullet proof. This does not mean that the problems are new; this does not mean that the content is ground breaking or earth-shattering; no such promise was made to the NSF.... Lots is yet left to be done". AM writes "I wrote this grant". Also "Had I chosen to wait a year until I met the immigration status requirement of the NSF for PIIing CONCEPT someone else's name would not have appeared as the PI of the project".

September 11, 2007: AM wrote to JA (Cced to GS and JJ) and asked that the copy of materials she had left in the office be delivered to GS's office. AM was concerned that the materials in their final form were not submitted to, or viewed by, WO.

September 10 and 17, 2007: AM wrote GS two messages in which she outlined both the history of the grant and the extent of her involvement in it. She outlined the circumstances surrounding the accusations. She listed a few issues that needed to be addressed by the project PI regarding her elimination from the project. She asked that a committee be assembled to examine the issue. This message contains text supporting the idea that AM believed that materials in draft were held to different (more relaxed) standards than those in final form. AM also mentions that materials were amended (just in time) during the semester that the course was taught not just at the end of the semester. AM wrote as a reaction to the allegations, "I was using other people's materials without citing them. This was all so sudden. Lisa was in my class only the day before... Neither one of them (LD and DL) seemed to understand that the material used in the pilot course was not for public use or open to release." [definition of public?]. Note also the following [occurred in the spring?], "Doug felt that in order to put the matter behind us and to protect this project, it would be best to put samples of our materials on webpage. I agreed with his suggestion and provided him with an electronic version of the text that was still a work in progress."

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

September 10, 2007: AM first wrote an e-mail and then contacted WO to ask about the report sent to her. According to AM:

WO mentioned that he felt the motivation behind the insinuations was to keep the grant funds on campus.

WO expressed concerns about the project staff being able to complete duties without her involvement.

WO suggested that by proposing that an investigation be made this issue would have to be examined.

WO informed AM that since BK was retiring in December 2007 and that he too was retiring he felt by requesting an investigation be made the matter would be looked into before he left office.

WO was concerned that AM had been deliberately excluded from any conversation regarding the grant.

WO suggested that AM write to GS and provide the history and context of CONCEPT and her project related activities.

September 8, 2007: AM received a letter from WO's office indicating that he was recommending an investigation be undertaken. The document WO submitted included summaries of interviews with different individuals in the department [of mathematics]. AM believed that the line of inquiry surrounded whether she was difficult to work with and her reasons for leaving CMU.

August 16, 2007: AM received an e-mail from KWS and learned that WO had contacted him and asked questions about the grant.

July 27, 2007: AM contacted WO via e-mail first. WO asked that she contact him by phone to explain why the decision was made that subcontracting the grant not be approved by his office. AM learned that during the meeting WO had with BK and DL it was suggested to him that subcontracting should not happen: BK had, according to WO, stated that people in the mathematics department did not know how to work with each other. Second one of them had suggested that the authenticity of the materials AM had developed needed to be investigated, that had AM plagiarized resources in creating the text. WO concluded at the end of his conversation with AM that subcontracting the

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

grant was not a good idea and that CR would be in touch with DL and AM about the plans. AM was asked to honor confidentiality and not contact NSF till the issue was resolved internally. AM asked that WO to examine her materials and check for authenticity.

AM requested that JA make copies of materials she had submitted and keep them on file. She was not told what to do or how to proceed. She assumed the deal was that she would be notified about what [when] she could contact the NSF. E-mail message includes a list of AM's project related responsibilities.

July 26, 2007: AM contacted CR to learn about any decisions made regarding her involvement in the project. She mentioned to him that she was leaving town on the 27th and needed to learn of her responsibilities to the grant.

July 23, 2007: AM had a phone conversation with CR. AM was notified by CR that a meeting with WO had taken place to discuss the subcontracting of the funds. The meeting was requested by BK and DL. CR did not know what the meeting was about and was, according to AM, surprised that AM was not asked to be present. AM was reassured that she would be notified of developments on the matter.

July 20, 2007: AM submitted copies of materials developed for MATH 362 to be distributed among the advisory board members. AM left a copy for CVE to use in his class during Fall 2006 [fall 2007?].

July 18/19, 2007: DL and AM exchanged e-mails regarding the upcoming advisory board. AM reassured DL that she would continue to carry her share of the responsibilities to the project.

July 17/18, 2007: AM's possessions were moved from Mt. Pleasant to Ohio.

July 13, 2007: AM asked DL to be notified of her responsibilities to the grant. DL responded that he was not the person to make decisions and that she needed to contact WO (e-mails were CCed to BK). AM explained to DL that decisions concerning the

division of funds could not be made without input from both AM and DL (e-mails were CCed to BK).

July 11, 2007: AM notified CVE that she did not want him involved in the re-write of the materials she had developed. AM mentioned to CVE that while she did not know whether he was asked to do so or not he needed to know where she stood on the issue. Both DL and DSJ were also notified of AM's decisions regarding CVE's involvement.

July 11, 2007: AM e-mail to [REDACTED] (forwarded by JJ on November 4, 2007). AM informs [REDACTED] of work (surveys and interviews) that needed to be completed in 07-08. Instruments pertaining to the work were attached to the message.

July 10, 2007: AM was notified by JA that CVE was assigned to work on MATH 362. AM had not given permission for his involvement. AM indicated that these discussions and agreements had been made sometime in May/early June.

July 8, 2007: DL and AM met to discuss the division of labor issues during the upcoming years. It was agreed that funds would be divided. DL would lead the data collection. AM would be involved in data analysis, refining the instruments, participate in work with pilot visits; and re-writing the materials (362). AM mentioned to DL that she had asked for time off from OSU for the winter quarter to be on CMU campus for the piloting of 462 materials. AM and DL also agreed that AM would have funding for a graduate student to help with the rewrite of materials. AM proposed that she would work on transporting the new program to OSU. DL said that he would meet with CR and that he would contact OSU (he mentioned the name of someone he knew there). AM mentioned to him that she needed to be involved as well pointing out that she could have met with CR in June. DL mentioned that CVE would be teaching Math 362 in Spring and could participate in the re-write of the materials for the course. AM objected to the suggestion and communicated her reservations about giving the materials she had spent a year and half to develop to someone else.

June 18, 2007: AM contacted CR and asked for a time to meet. AM mentioned to CR that she wanted to wait till DL was back from summer vacation.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

June 2007: AM notified DL of her plans to move to OSU. AM and DL discussed plans for summer workshops and organizing sessions for pilot sites representatives. AM announced her departure from CMU and requested a leave of absence.

May 2007: AM agreed to lead a graduate student's MA thesis with the understanding that the student would assist with the data collection and analysis. DL was notified.

April 4, 2007: AM learned that DL and LD had retrieved the course materials from the students in MTH 362.

April 3?, 2007: DL asked that project materials be put on the webpage as a way to protect the materials. AM mentioned to him that it was too soon since the materials were still being revised. According to AM she submitted materials, in electronic form, to DL. DL and AM agreed that they would read each other's work and provide feedback.

March 31, 2007: AM left town for a meeting. AM sent DL a message (forwarded to us by JJ on November 4). AM's note indicates that the message confirms that DL was in possession of CD's for two interviews. The actual message indicates "I am putting a copy of one or two of the interviews in your mailbox."

March 29, 2007: AM was notified by JA that he had spoken with the dean and that the matter was resolved. AM asked JA (and submitted to him the complete package of materials) that he continue reading the materials and provide feedback on what needed to be changed, particularly what needed to be referenced.

March 26-28?, 2007: LD and JA met with BK during which LD had mentioned that AM had used materials without the permission of authors. It was AM's understanding that LD's promotion file was denied and that LD had organized a meeting with BK to discuss her case. AM became aware of the meeting on the 28th through JA. He came by AM's office to apologize and to mention that he had over-reacted without looking carefully at what was being done. He casually mentioned that he and LD had gone to the dean and talked to him.

Black – committee, blue – Bob Kohrman, red – Wayne Osborn, lilac – Doug Lapp, green – Azita Manouchehri. The colour denotes from whom the information came. In many cases the wording used is directly from, or slightly modified from, the information provided by the individual.

Spring 2006 [should be spring 2007 KF]: Pilot class-Materials were being piloted, revised, re-written, and new activities were being developed.

Summer 2006: Initial analysis of data. Meeting with the advisory board (August 2006). Upon the advisory board's recommendation for the need for collecting interview data and revising the conceptual test AM worked on these two agendas as well.

Spring 2006: "devoted to studying the literature, developing Module II and III activities, deciding what to use from high school textbooks, building a tentative curriculum materials to be piloted in Spring 2007".

January 2006: AM began to work on development of MATH 362 with LD.

December 2005: AM was notified by CVE that the MATH 362 writing team had not worked on the development of materials. CVE announced that he was unable to devote time to project

May 2005: Announcement of approval of funding for CONCEPT project.

