


Leah H. Jamieson  
Interim Dean of Engineering  
Ransburg Professor of Electrical & Computer Engineering

To: Inquiry Committee Members

From: Leah H. Jamieson, Ph.D., Interim Dean 

Date: July 31, 2006

Re: Inquiry Committee Charge (Revised) – Sonofusion Research – C-22 Proceeding

Copy to: Professor Rusi Taleyarkhan, Professor Jay Gore, Professor Shripad T. Revankar, Dr. Yiban Xu, Mr. Adam Butt, Dr. Charles O. Rutledge, Dr. Peter E. Dunn

Thank you for agreeing to serve on the Inquiry Committee which I have appointed under Purdue University's Executive Memorandum No. C-22, Policy on Integrity in Research. ("C-22"). This committee will conduct an inquiry into allegations of possible research misconduct under the procedures outlined in C-22.

In his capacity as Purdue's Research Integrity Officer, Dr. Peter E. Dunn will provide staff support for the Inquiry Committee from the Office of the Vice President for Research.

**Background**

On April 17, 2006, an Examination Committee was formed by Dr. Dunn on behalf of Dr. Charles O. Rutledge, Vice President for Research, to examine facts and circumstances in connection with certain aspects of sonofusion research at Purdue. This committee was directed to determine, among other things, if the facts and circumstances led the committee to recognize any allegations of research misconduct as defined in C-22.

After completing its examination, on June 5, 2006 the committee issued its Examination Committee Report to Dr. Rutledge. Upon receiving the report, Dr. Rutledge asked each member of the Examination Committee to clarify whether or not the committee's examination recognized an allegation of potential research misconduct. Each committee member confirmed that possibility to Dr. Rutledge.

On June 9, 2006 Dr. Rutledge sent a letter to me forwarding the Examination Committee Report and the letters and memoranda which were referenced in his letter. His letter asked me to treat the report and the enclosed items as constituting an allegation that research misconduct as defined in C-22 may have occurred. Dr. Rutledge's letter further requested that I inform Professor Rusi Taleyarkhan, Professor Jay Gore, Professor Shripad T. Revankar, Dr. Yiban Xu and Mr. Adam Butt (the "named individuals") about this allegation of possible research misconduct, and that I form this Inquiry Committee.

2125

Office of the Dean

On June 16, 2006, Dr. Rutledge sent me a letter containing the clarifying comments which he had received from members of the Examination Committee concerning the possibility that research misconduct had occurred.

**Charge To The Inquiry Committee**

This Inquiry Committee is responsible for conducting its proceedings in accordance with all of the provisions of C-22 which are applicable to the inquiry phase. Using C-22 as its guide, the committee is further instructed as follows:

1. The Inquiry Committee is charged with (i) conducting an inquiry into allegations of research misconduct identified in the Examination Committee Report and associated materials which were included with Dr. Rutledge's June 9, 2006 letter to me, (ii) voting to decide if an investigation of one or more research misconduct allegations against any of the named individuals in connection with those matters is warranted, (iii) preparing a separate written report of the results of its inquiry with respect to each named individual, and (iv) sending a copy of the report relating to a named individual to that individual, and sending a copy of all of the reports to me.
  - a. In the course of the inquiry, each named individual and the allegations of research misconduct by that individual should be considered separately to the extent it is possible to do so.
  - b. This committee is not charged with finally deciding if one or more of the named individuals in fact committed research misconduct. Rather, this committee's responsibility is to determine if it is more likely that not that a named individual committed research misconduct, in which case a separate Investigation Committee will be formed to conduct a formal examination and evaluation of the evidence with respect to such possible misconduct.
  - c. If this Inquiry Committee votes that one or more allegations of research misconduct by a named individual should be investigated further by an Investigation Committee, the Inquiry Committee's report with respect to that named individual must identify each such allegation.
2. The Examination Committee Report references possible "academic misconduct." C-22 does not define or refer to "academic misconduct." Therefore, because this Inquiry Committee is only chartered under C-22, this committee has neither the responsibility nor the authority to consider whether "academic misconduct" may have taken place, except to the extent that "research misconduct" as defined in C-22 might also be considered to be "academic misconduct."



3. C-22 defines "research misconduct" as follows:

" 'Research misconduct' shall mean, for the purposes of this policy, fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scientific and academic community for proposing, conducting, or reporting research. It does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data."

This definition must form the basis for the Inquiry Committee's deliberations and conclusions.

4. Because the Examination Committee Report does not specifically use the term "research misconduct," as an initial step the Inquiry Committee should interview the members of the Examination Committee to seek further clarification regarding what allegations of potential research misconduct the committee recognized, and what the basis was for such recognition. Thereafter, the Inquiry Committee should review such materials, interview such witnesses, and consider such information as the committee needs to reach its conclusions.

**Attachments**

Copies of the following items are attached to assist the Inquiry Committee:

1. Executive Memorandum No. C-22.
2. April 17, 2006 memorandum from Dr. Dunn establishing and charging the Examination Committee.
3. June 5, 2006 Examination Committee Report.
4. June 9, 2006 letter from Dr. Rutledge to Dr. Jamieson, with enclosures.
5. June 16, 2006 letter from Dr. Rutledge to Dr. Jamieson.