To: AIGI  
File Number: I89110010  
Date: 02 March 2002  
Subject: Closeout Memo  

There was no closeout written at the time this case was closed. The following information was extracted from the file in conformance with standard closeout documents.

Our office was informed that the subject\(^1\) was alleged to have committed other illegal acts. The subject accepted voluntary exclusion until a specified date\(^2\) rather than have a debarment hearing. The investigation report and its resolution are attached as part of this closeout.

Accordingly this case is closed.

\(^1\) Dr. Dennis R. Rasmussen  
\(^2\) August 24, 1995
SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Recitals

A. The National Science Foundation (NSF) issued Grants [redacted] and [redacted] to the [redacted] under the NSF program entitled Research Experiences for Undergraduates.

B. Dr. Dennis Rasmussen served as co-principal investigator on those grants.

C. Dr. Rasmussen is not currently an applicant for a grant with any agency of the federal government.

D. The Office of Inspector General (OIG) has issued an investigative report concerning the above-referenced grants.

E. NSF issued a notice of proposed debarment of Dr. Rasmussen on August 24, 1990, and provided Dr. Rasmussen with an opportunity to respond.

F. Dr. Rasmussen read the OIG investigative report and NSF's notice of proposed debarment carefully, submitted information and argument in response to the proposed debarment, and requested a hearing.

G. Dr. Rasmussen has chosen to proceed without benefit of legal counsel.

Agreement

After careful evaluation, Dr. Rasmussen and NSF agree to settle this matter as follows:

1. Under the terms of the Governmentwide debarment regulations, 45 CFR part 620, Dr. Rasmussen has decided to exclude himself voluntarily rather than have a hearing.

2. Dr. Rasmussen will not be an applicant (principal investigator or co-principal investigator) or be among the senior, key, or supervisory personnel on a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement for scientific, mathematics, or engineering research or education with any agency of the Executive branch of the United States government until after August 24, 1995, which is 5 years after the date of the notice of proposed debarment.
3. Dr. Rasmussen will not serve as a reviewer on an NSF grant proposal until after August 24, 1995.

4. NSF will take no further action against Dr. Rasmussen in this matter.

This Agreement is entered into as of this day, February 21, 1991. The Agreement will be considered null and void if it is not executed by the Director of NSF on or before February 28, 1991.

Dr. Dennis Rasmussen
Asst. Counsel to Inspector General
National Science Foundation

Witness:

I, Dr. Rasmussen, have signed this agreement on a voluntary basis, without duress or coercion of any type. I read the agreement carefully, understand it, and have decided to proceed to sign the agreement without benefit of counsel.

Dr. Dennis Rasmussen

I, Robert W. Gay (PhD.), attest that Dr. Rasmussen has advised me that he has signed this agreement on a voluntary basis, without duress or coercion of any type; that he has read the agreement carefully and understands it; and that he has decided to proceed to sign the agreement without benefit of counsel.

Robert W. Gay
Delivered By Hand

Dr. Dennis R. Rasmussen

RE: NOTICE OF PROPOSED DEBARMENT; TRANSMITTAL OF INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

Dear Dr. Rasmussen:

This letter and the attached Investigative Report serves as formal notice that the National Science Foundation (NSF) proposes to debar you from directly or indirectly obtaining the benefits of Federal research grants for a period of five years. A person who is debarred will be excluded during the period of debarment from Federal financial and nonfinancial assistance and benefits under nonprocurement Federal programs and activities. See 45 CFR 620.110, 620.200. Debarment of an individual is effective throughout the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Reasons for Proposed Debarment

NSF's decision to propose debarment is based upon a referral from our Office of Inspector General. The Foundation's current administrative record indicates that you engaged in a deliberate pattern of serious, sexual malfeasance and related acts while supervising teaching assistants and undergraduates in the conduct of research funded by NSF. As documented in the attached Investigative Report, ten witnesses have described an extensive pattern of incidents from December 1988 to August 1989. Those incidents involve numerous sexual assaults and unwanted and unexpected sexual advances made by you against female students and teaching assistants working under your supervision.

In addition to the alleged acts of sexual malfeasance, you apparently committed other distinct and identifiable offenses contrary to accepted scientific practice. For example, the Investigative Report indicates that you threatened your subordinates with damage to their careers if they revealed your sexual misbehavior, and that you withheld data and assistance from students for the purpose of personal sexual advantage.

NSF provided financial support to the and to you as a co-principal investigator under our program entitled "Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU)." (NSF grants and A)
fundamental purpose of the REU program is to encourage undergraduates -- in particular women undergraduates -- to enter into scientific careers. The many acts of abuse of which you are accused were directed against female teaching assistants and undergraduates, and occurred in the context of, and were inseparable from, the scientific research conducted under the REU grants. By your actions, as alleged, you seriously departed from accepted research practices and undermined a basic purpose of the REU program -- the mentorship of potential young scientists, women in particular.

Regulatory Basis for Proposed Debarment

Under NSF's regulations, "misconduct" is defined to include a "serious deviation from accepted practices in ... carrying out ... research." 45 CFR 689.1(a). When misconduct is serious, deliberate, and part of a pattern instead of an isolated event, debarment from Federal financial assistance is an appropriate remedy. See 45 CFR 689.2(a)(3), 689.2(b). Debarment is also appropriate for any "cause of so serious a nature that it affects the present responsibility of a person." 45 CFR 620.305(d).

Debarment must be for a period commensurate with the seriousness of the cause. 45 CFR 620.320(a). The burden of proof is on the government to establish facts which justify debarment by a preponderance of the evidence. 45 CFR 689.2(d), 620.314(c).

According to the Investigative Report, your many acts of abuse directed against young women were perpetrated during the conduct of research funded by NSF to encourage undergraduates (and specifically women undergraduates) to enter into scientific careers. Indeed, responsible mentorship of young students and assistants is essential to the scientific process at its core. Because your actions, as alleged, were such an integral part of the research supported by the NSF grants, they significantly distorted the research experience, represented serious deviations from accepted practices, and served to eviscerate one of the basic purposes of the NSF research program. Accordingly, we are proposing a serious remedy, debarment, for a period of five years.

Procedures Governing Proposed Debarment/Scientific Misconduct Allegations

Under our regulations you have 30 days after receipt of this notice to submit -- in person, in writing, or through a representative -- information and argument in opposition to the proposed debarment. 45 CFR 620.313(a). During this 30-day period you may also review the attached Investigative Report and submit comments or rebuttal. 45 CFR 689.8(c)(1), 689.1(e). Comments submitted within the 30-day period will receive full consideration and may lead to revision or withdrawal of the
Assuming you receive this letter on Monday, August 27, 1990, the 30-day period expires on September 26, 1990.

If we do not receive a response to this notice on or before September 26, 1990, the debarment will become final. Any response should be addressed to me at Office of the General Counsel, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20550. For your information we are attaching a copy of the Foundation's regulations on Nonprocurement Debarment and Misconduct in Science and Engineering. If you have any questions about the attached Investigative Report, please contact Lawrence Rudolph, Counsel to the Inspector General, at (202) 357-9457.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Rudolph
Acting General Counsel

Attachments (2)
INVESTIGATIVE REPORT--
FINDINGS CONCERNING RESEARCH MISCONDUCT
BY DR. DENNIS R. RASMUSSEN

BASIS FOR INVESTIGATION

On November 27, 1989 the Office of Inspector General (OIG) received letters from two women who had served as graduate teaching assistants during courses taught in the summer of 1989 by Dr. Dennis R. Rasmussen. The courses were conducted under an NSF grant to the [redacted], headquartered in [redacted]. The letters alleged that while directing the courses Rasmussen had sexually assaulted or harassed female teaching assistants and students, had made threats of professional blacklisting against them, and had been intoxicated when many of these acts took place.

In December 1989, OIG began a preliminary inquiry into these allegations under the NSF regulations regarding misconduct in science and engineering (45 CFR 689). The inquiry revealed that there was evidence to support the allegations and, moreover, that sexual misbehavior by Rasmussen appeared to be part of a pattern of misconduct in research. We also learned that five teaching assistants had reported the allegations mentioned above to officials about August 16, 1989, during the summer courses. OIG did not investigate the allegations, but did notify Rasmussen that [redacted] was terminating its association with him upon completion of his work under the NSF grant. OIG determined that the evidence warranted a full misconduct investigation. Since OIG did not conduct a full investigation, OIG decided to perform the investigation itself, under authority of 45 CFR 689 and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended.

METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Like the inquiry, the formal investigation was conducted by a Special Agent, Office of Internal Audit and Investigations, OIG. It began in late April 1990. Telephone interviews were conducted to identify possible witnesses. Nine witnesses were personally interviewed in [redacted]. They provided sworn statements. One witness, who is currently in Scotland, provided a notarized written statement. Dr. Rasmussen, the subject of the investigation, was also interviewed in [redacted], but declined to provide a written statement.
BACKGROUND AND CHRONOLOGY

Dr. Dennis R. Rasmussen holds a Ph.D. in comparative psychology. He has been an independent researcher at the . In 1988 and 1989 he served as a Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI) on two successive NSF grants, Nos. and . The awards were made to with , the President of as Principal Investigator, and the Dean of as another Co-PI.1

Grants and were made under the Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) program. The purpose of REU awards, as stated in the Program Announcement (NSF 88-28), is to provide active and meaningful research experience to undergraduates in order to attract talented students to careers in science, mathematics, and engineering. Through this program, NSF is particularly interested in increasing the participation of women, minority, and disabled students.

These two grants to were entitled . They provided funding for scholarships and associated costs in order to enable a number of undergraduates to take part in field research during the summer months. The research involved the study of . In both 1988 and 1989, Rasmussen led the study teams as Senior Faculty Member on the site.

At students were supposed to make observations, make tentative statistical analyses of the data, write a preliminary paper, and give an oral report. In the academic year following the field course they were supposed to take independent study courses at their home institutions, analyze and write up their results with Rasmussen's help, and write a paper based on their research that they would submit for publication.

In 1988, two summer courses were given to a total of about 30 undergraduate students; 10 of them received NSF scholarships and all of the students benefited from NSF's support for the summer program. Rasmussen also gave a course for students, not supported by NSF, at the site in the winter of 1988-89. In the summer of 1989, two courses were given to 30 students, this time including eight NSF scholarship students.

NSF funding for the 1988 and 1989 summer courses also covered salaries for the PI and the two co-PI's, including Rasmussen.

---

1In Proposal No. the Dean of is listed as Dr. 
In Proposal No. the Dean is Dr. 

2
Salaries were provided for an Associate Faculty Member and a logistics assistant to accompany Rasmussen at the site. However, did not send an Associate Faculty Member to the site in the summer of 1989. Instead, Rasmussen was assisted by five graduate teaching assistants (TA's), all of whom happened to be women.

Although Grant No. provided funds for the faculty to fly to for the summer 1989 program Rasmussen chose to drive with the TA's in his pickup truck. According to testimony, this was done for reasons of economy. In December 1988, Rasmussen also drove to with one undergraduate student in preparation for the winter course. Some of the major allegations in this case have to do with Rasmussen's behavior during these trips.

EVIDENTIARY FINDINGS

This section will discuss the specific findings OIG has made, divided by subject area, on the basis of the evidence collected. Attachments 1 through 5 are an integral part of this presentation. The next section will present OIG's conclusions and evaluations based on these findings, and will discuss the relevance of the findings to research misconduct.

Sexual Malfeasance Written statements and telephone interviews document a pattern of incidents from December 1988 to August 1989 in which Rasmussen sexually assaulted or made unwanted and unexpected sexual advances to female students or teaching assistants working under his supervision. Many of these incidents occurred while Rasmussen was intoxicated.

Seventeen specific incidents are listed and fully described in Attachment 1. Those numbered 13 and 16 are the only ones in which the women involved participated voluntarily. In the other cases, the women were subjected to unwanted and unexpected physical assaults.

Two witnesses testified that Rasmussen sexually assaulted them in the back of his truck (Incidents 1 and 12). The first incident occurred in December 1988 while driving to the field site in The student involved was assisting Rasmussen with the research data under Grant At the research site, this student was subjected to another physical sexual advance by Rasmussen (Incident 2).

Rasmussen also made remarks, accusations, and suggestions of a sexual nature and was not always decently dressed in front of students, apparently intentionally. In addition, he made racist remarks to a black student. Documentation for these events is not provided here, but is available.
Incidents 11-12 also occurred en route to the site in this time in June 1989. During Incident 12, Rasmussen succeeded in having sexual intercourse without the consent of the woman, an NSF-funded teaching assistant under Grant [redacted]. After this attack she participated in a voluntary sexual relationship with Rasmussen. When she ended this relationship, Rasmussen threatened her with professional blackmail if she reported his actions (See Attachment 3, Incident 2). The two forcible sexual contacts in December 1988 and June 1989 are separated by time, but in both situations Rasmussen acted similarly. In both cases, while traveling to the field site in Rasmussen trapped the women in the back of his truck and forcibly made contact with their sexual organs. We have interviewed all of the witnesses involved, including Rasmussen and a third party who observed the act of intercourse in June 1989. We are confident that we can establish by a preponderance of the evidence that these acts did occur in the way the victims testified that they occurred.

Other witnesses testified that Rasmussen sexually assaulted them and made unwanted and unexpected physical sexual advances. For example, Incidents 4 through 9, which took place in February through May 1989. All but Incident 8 involve students who participated in the two summer programs supported by NSF. These incidents evidence a pattern of unwanted and unexpected physical sexual advances by Rasmussen when he was alone with a woman.

Rasmussen also made physical sexual advances against students and teaching assistants who benefited from NSF funding for the summer courses in 1989. Less than 48 hours after meeting a teaching assistant for the 1989 courses in June 1989, Rasmussen made a physical sexual advance at his home after his wife and family had left the back garden. (Incident 10.)

The last incidents listed, numbered 14 through 17, took place in August 1989, at the field site. After the TA terminated their sexual relationship, Rasmussen again made advances toward her. Later he made an advance toward a student and made an unwanted sexual advance toward another TA. On these occasions he was intoxicated.

Rasmussen was interviewed on May 3, 1990 and was given the chance to refute the allegations known at that time. A summary of this interview is given in Attachment 2. It shows that he denied ever drinking tequila or being intoxicated. With regard to sexual

---

3Incident 8 involves an employee. While it does not concern NSF directly, it helps to illustrate a pattern of behavior on Rasmussen's part.
behavior, his responses were more ambiguous. He never admitted to any of the incidents and he denied several. However, he occasionally refused to answer and once said only that all his relationships with staff and students were in good taste. He blamed the students and TA's for approaching him sexually and indicated that he was being persecuted and was the victim of a conspiracy.

OIG has considered all the testimony and has determined that Rasmussen did in fact engage in an extensive pattern of sexual malfeasance involving students and TA's in connection with NSF awards. The nine sworn affidavits, the notarized statement, and the telephone conversations provide detailed and mutually supporting accounts of Rasmussen's malfeasance. These statements were given voluntarily, most of them under oath, and with no expectation of personal benefit. On the other hand Rasmussen's statement is vague and inconsistent, and he refused to sign it.

Specifically, seven witnesses state that Rasmussen consumed tequila and was intoxicated while in [redacted] in the summer of 1989, while he denies it. Ten witnesses, plus telephone interviews, support the charges of sexual misbehavior, which Rasmussen refuses to admit. His claims of being the victim of a conspiracy are refuted by the fact that some of the witnesses do not know each other. In spite of this, they testify to consistent patterns of behavior by Rasmussen from one incident to another.

Most of the 17 incidents in Attachment 1 are characterized by Rasmussen exerting physical coercion on the women involved. There are other situations, as indicated below, where Rasmussen used his control over the computer and the data to induce students to accept his sexual advances. Although they are less dramatic, these incidents of nonphysical sexual coercion are also central to this case.

Professional blackmail Four TA's have testified that during the 1989 summer program Rasmussen threatened them with professional blacklisting in the [redacted] community and with "academic sanctions" if they revealed his sexual behavior with TA's and students. Their testimony is excerpted in Attachment 3.4

Incidents 1 and 2 in the Attachment especially concern the TA who unwillingly had sexual intercourse with Rasmussen while traveling to the summer 1989 program. She was threatened in order to keep her from revealing this incident and her subsequent sexual

4In addition, Incident 6 in Attachment 1 documents Rasmussen's threat to "make or break" the career of a student in connection with one of his sexual advances.
relationship with Rasmussen. Apparently Rasmussen was particularly worried about the TA's reporting him, and accused them of being hired to spy on him.

In his interview, Rasmussen denied having threatened the TA's with academic sanctions and professional blacklisting. (See Attachment 2.) OIG finds the detailed statements of four different TA's to be far more credible than Rasmussen's denial.

Favoritism and coercion through control over computer and data
At the site in the summer of 1988 and 1989, Rasmussen monopolized the use of the computers on which data were collected and analyzed. TA's and students did not receive all the training in the use of computers for statistical analysis that was promised in the proposal. Instead, they had to go to Rasmussen for help. This delayed the work, took his time from other research activities, decreased the educational value of the program for students and TA's, and decreased student understanding of the data. Attachment 4 illustrates this situation.

Rasmussen's control over the computer and the data also created the opportunity for favoritism and sexual harassment. Some students were given more time on the computer and more assistance with data analysis. This reportedly happened especially with more attractive female students. These students were able to finish sooner and had better final projects. On the other hand, one student did not receive sufficient assistance in retrieving and interpreting the data, so that she was not able to use some pertinent data in writing her paper. In order to keep some TA's from reporting his sexual misbehavior, Rasmussen threatened to keep the data from them. (See Attachment 3.)

Sexual harassment arose because female students who wanted access to the data and the analytic programs on the computer were subjected to sexual advances, which they had to accept as a condition for receiving Rasmussen's help. Excerpts from the affidavits describing this situation are given in Attachment 4.

These problems persisted after the summer sessions, when students were supposed to receive Rasmussen's help in analyzing the data in order to write publishable papers. One 1989 student in fact never received the necessary data from Rasmussen. Because of problems in getting the data, some students failed to produce their papers or produced them very late. One student complained that after the 1988 summer program Rasmussen limited her access to the data and the analytic programs, so that she was forced to go to _______ to work with him. Because of sexual advances he made there, she was unable to complete her work at _______. An NSF student was also unable to complete her data analysis in _______ because of Rasmussen's advances. She had to return to _______ in 1989, after having already taken the 1988 program, in order to get the needed help from Rasmussen without being alone.
Harmful effects of experience on TA's and students Dr. Rasmussen's behavior had a harmful effect on many of the students who participated in the 1988 and 1989 summer courses, as well as on the five TA's who served in 1989. Most of the TA's have stated that they refuse to work with Rasmussen any further, and most are also refusing to work with the data. Several students from 1988 and 1989 who had entered the project expecting to do follow-up research eventually dropped their projects because of Rasmussen's behavior as described above.

Some students who did choose to complete their follow-up work with Rasmussen experienced delays and frustrations in their attempts to obtain data and were subjected to his sexual advances. In addition to the lost time, these students reported that their experience with Rasmussen made it difficult for them to cooperate with males in doing research in the field. The TA with whom Rasmussen had sexual intercourse without her consent subsequently went into counseling. She reports that she has turned down research opportunities because of the fear of working with males that she acquired through this experience. See Attachment 5 and also Attachment 4.

CONCLUSIONS

OIG concludes that Dr. Dennis R. Rasmussen has committed serious misconduct under 45 CFR 689. In support of this conclusion, we note the following points.

NSF has jurisdiction because NSF funding was directly involved in this case. Most of the allegations involve the summer 1989 program, which had support from NSF Grant No. Rasmussen and the TA's were directly supported by NSF, and all of the students benefited because of NSF's support for the summer program. Abuse of any student on a project with NSF support is equally serious. In addition, all but one of the sexual misbehavior incidents prior to the summer 1989 program involve students who were completing their work under NSF Grant No. which was still in effect.

The evidence shows that the alleged events did take place. Extensive documentation has been presented here, but more is available. Sworn testimony by numerous witnesses and participants shows a high degree of consistency, while Rasmussen's rebuttals are unconvincing. The preponderance of evidence clearly is against Rasmussen.

We also note that the witness-participants have acted on their beliefs in several instances. Students and TA's refused to work with Rasmussen after the course, or refused to work with the
data. This was at a cost to them, because it represented a lost opportunity to produce publications based on the data collected and thereby advance their careers. For the students, it also involved the loss of part of their summer stipend. These people made their decision, and gave their testimony, because of their belief that Rasmussen's behavior was unprofessional and intolerable and that because of his behavior the data produced at the site were of inferior quality.

Rasmussen seriously failed to meet the objectives of the REU program. The review of REU by NSF's Office of Budget and Control states: "REU began operations in 1987... Intended to intervene in the trend of decreasing annual production of Ph.D.'s in science and engineering, REU was designed to give undergraduate students an opportunity to experience academic research first-hand and learn about graduate school at a point during their study at which they needed to make decisions about their future. From the beginning, REU emphasized the inclusion of women and minorities... as participants in REU awards." (NSF 90-58)

Clearly the purpose of the program is to provide positive, enjoyable, and scientifically sound research experiences for the participants, especially women, in order to encourage them to take up careers in research. Common sense dictates that projects under this program should be overseen by someone who is not only an excellent researcher and teacher, but one who works well and responsibly with young people and who can provide an excellent research atmosphere.

In fact, some good research and educational experiences were reported by some students under Grants and . However, there is ample evidence that a number of students and TA's were subjected to bad experiences, in the course of their research and training and during their preparation for the program, that were directly the fault of Rasmussen. As a result of these experiences they received a thoroughly distorted impression of what research is about, their career progress was slowed, some did not finish their work under the NSF projects, and a few of the worst affected found themselves unable to participate freely in future research projects because of emotional trauma.

Rasmussen particularly flouted the REU objective of attracting women into scientific careers. The abuse of female students and TA's is unacceptable in any NSF program, but especially in one with this objective.

Rasmussen seriously failed to meet the research and educational objectives of the proposal. The is a not-for-profit corporation. According to its annual reports, conducts field research courses for undergraduates
throughout the world, and its courses are accredited by many of this country's best universities.

In its Proposal No. applying for funding for the 1989 summer program, proudly advertised its approach to research training for undergraduates. The proposal states, in part: "Our experience has shown that total immersion in subject material is a remarkably efficient and effective method for learning. As such, we design courses with several structural components in common. Al programs take place in isolated settings so that the distractions of modern day living (TV, alcohol, noise, etc.) cannot intrude on one's attention. Dramatic program settings such as the rim around Lake in are chosen for their ability to inspire curiosity and wonder. Faculty are selected not only for their academic and scientific credentials but also for their leadership ability, their sensitivity and concern for students, and their ability to be both a role model and mentor. A total immersion program such as also facilitates collegial relationships between faculty and students as well as between students... The rugged and challenging settings of programs require cooperation in data collection and analysis or else research grinds to a halt."

Eight years of operation have allowed to carefully refine the structure and content of programs to the point where we truly understand the dynamics of what makes a first rate field program. The emotional state of students must be monitored as they progress... This emotional development is paralleled by an academic structure which seeks to move students from a dependent status as the program begins to a relatively independent status as the program ends."

Two faculty and a teaching assistant are involved in the program 24 hours a day for 30 days. This is not only a remarkable commitment from our faculty but it is a unique opportunity for students to have access to faculty as well as come to know them as people. A great deal of informal but often tremendously valuable learning comes from such close interaction."

The proposal also emphasizes repeatedly that students will be taught the computing and statistical tools necessary for the analysis of the data, including SPSS/PC+, at the research site. It states that after the summer session Rasmussen will help students analyze the data base and that an attempt will be made to accommodate those students who wish to work with Dr. Rasmussen at the to finish up data analyses or write up reports.

The evidence shows that many students were not given the required statistical and computer training. For some of them, their experience of the faculty was much different from what the proposal describes. They were kept dependent on Rasmussen for
the use of the computer and the running of the software. Hence they were not allowed to advance to an independent status as the program progressed. Instead, control over the data enabled Rasmussen to employ favoritism and coercion in obtaining the sexual responses of female students. These problems continued after the summer programs when Rasmussen did not make the data freely available, but instead used his control over the data to draw some female students to . Again, he used the occasion to make sexual advances to them.

It is easy to conclude that students were not protected from the distractions of alcohol, since Rasmussen occasionally drank to excess. He did not show leadership ability when he failed to train TA's and had a sexual relationship with at least one, nor did he show sensitivity and concern for students. Through his blackmailing of TA's he was not an acceptable role model or mentor. His sexual harassment showed no concern for the emotional state of his students. These requirements are not "icing on the cake," but represent points that were used in persuading NSF of the research and educational value of the program and its conformity with REU objectives. They are also requirements that and NSF placed on Rasmussen as senior faculty member.

Rasmussen's misconduct was serious, deliberate, and habitual. The many incidents of sexual activity show a pattern of abuse of women. Rasmussen was willing to use his advantage as a faculty member to coax or coerce subordinates into complying with his sexual demands. He overindulged in alcohol in work situations where he was responsible for the instruction and well-being of students. There is every reason to fear that this behavior would be repeated if Rasmussen were ever again given the opportunity to mentor the work of female students, particularly in isolated situations.

Rasmussen's behavior fits the definition of research misconduct. We do not maintain that sexual misbehavior by a researcher at a research site should always be regarded as misconduct within the definition of 45 CFR 689. However, there are circumstances in which sexual misbehavior is part of "other serious deviation from accepted practices in proposing, carrying out, or reporting results from research", as mentioned in the definition. We hope that sexually-related misconduct cases never become common enough to be mentioned explicitly in the definition, but unfortunately we have a case of that type here.

The salient feature of this case is that Rasmussen made his sexual activity and conversation an integral part of his performance as an educator and research mentor. He made physical sexual assaults using opportunities provided by his educational and research duties. He manipulated the educational and research environment so as to create opportunities for such assaults. He
used his position of control over the computers and the data to induce students and TA's to accept his sexual advances or even to approach him. It is not within "accepted practices" for a research mentor to use his or her position of authority to make demands of subordinates, such as sexual demands, that are unrelated to the research.

The situation is aggravated by the fact that at the research site Rasmussen was not only the senior faculty member but, in 1989, was the only faculty member. The women involved were relatively young undergraduates plus a group of five graduate students. They were particularly dependent on Rasmussen, partly for academic reasons in that they depended on him for instruction and data and for their final grades, but also because he was in charge of the physical arrangements. The research was done at an isolated site in a foreign country, where students and TA's could not easily leave or obtain help from others. In this situation, Rasmussen's sexual activities had a particularly coercive character.

In the course of these activities, Rasmussen committed many other distinct and identifiable offenses against accepted scientific practice. It is not accepted practice for a senior researcher to blackmail subordinates by threatening them with damage to their careers if they reveal his or her misconduct. It is not accepted practice for a researcher to withhold data and assistance from students, particularly when this is for the purpose of his or her personal sexual advantage. These incidents taken together show a pattern of failing to meet the requirements of training and research that represents a serious deviation from accepted research practices.

December 3, 1990
ATTACHMENT 1
INCIDENTS OF SEXUAL MISBEHAVIOR

Sworn statements and telephone interviews document the following 17 incidents of sexual misbehavior by Dr. Rasmussen. Together they involve six students, three teaching assistants, and an employee. In two of these incidents the woman participated voluntarily, but the rest involved an unwanted and unexpected physical attack by Rasmussen. Other incidents, in which the women were coerced in a nonphysical way, are mentioned elsewhere in this report.

1. December 1988, on a highway en route to the field site in Dr. Rasmussen sexually assaulted student A. At this time, Student A was a student from the University of assistant for NSF Grant and employed by as Dr. Rasmussen's assistant for NSF Grant. Dr. Rasmussen asked Student A to assist him in and Student A agreed. Dr. Rasmussen and student A were driving from to in the subject's truck when they decided to rest in the back of the truck. In her sworn statement, Student A stated, "I was just starting to fall asleep when I felt Dennis roll up against me and put his arm around me. When Dennis did this, he trapped me between his body and some boxes that were in the back of the truck. I asked him what he was doing and he responded that he was cold and needed my body heat. He then started to rub my side and back, then fondle my breast. I asked him to stop and he would for a minute then he would just start back up again. I felt really trapped in that position and tried to get him to stop but he continued to fondle me and eventually stuck his hand down my pants. I was shocked at this and frightened because I was not sure what he would do next. I immediately squirmed my arm free and knocked his hand out of my pants. I told Dennis that this would not work and I had to get some air." Student A got out of the back of the truck and suggested that they continue to drive. Later that night, Dr. Rasmussen rented a two bed hotel room in Dr. Rasmussen then made a sexual advance towards student A by demanding that student A give him a back rub and attempted to get into bed with Student A. Student A persuaded Dr. Rasmussen to go back to his bed without further incidents.

2. January 1989, in at the field site, Dr. Rasmussen was intoxicated and made a physical sexual advance toward Student A. Student A stated, "Then one evening Dennis went into town to call and his wife. When Dennis returned he was intoxicated and had a bottle of tequila. I had been working in the computer room when Dennis told me that he had to talk to me. I thought he wanted to talk about the course. He said let's go up to the tents because the students were working in and around the computer room. Once up at the tents he placed his hands around my shoulders and touched my inner thigh. He wanted us to go into
my tent but I refused. Again I felt intimidated and afraid but rejected his advances."

When describing these incidents, Student A recalled, "These incidents made me feel threatened and insecure of myself because I didn't know why he would do this to me. Dennis had been my mentor, my teacher, and my supervisor through my employment with . He had also been my friend and I had a close friendship with his wife, and his two children. I trusted him and he violated that trust. Dennis took advantage of his position as mentor and friend. I think he used his position to intimidate me and to put me in a situation where I had little control."

3. February 1989, in at Dr. Rasmussen's office, Dr. Rasmussen tried to kiss Student B. Student B was a student from the summer 1988, and was in to work with Dr. Rasmussen on follow-up research with the data base from the project.

4. March 1989, in Dr. Rasmussen's car, Dr. Rasmussen made a sexual advance toward student C. Student C was a student from the summer 1988 and went to to work with Dr. Rasmussen on follow-up research with the data base from the project. Student C stated that she went to because Dr. Rasmussen would not release by mail the data that she needed for her research and that she stayed with Dr. Rasmussen and his family at his request. Recalling this incident, Student C stated, "The second night I was there, Dr. Rasmussen and I were in his car and he was driving fast around corners. Dr. Rasmussen would grab at my crotch while turning the corners. I was not sure what he was doing so I positioned my purse beside me so he could not grab me. That day Dr. Rasmussen had told me that he thought he would be getting a divorce and that night in the car he said that it had been a long time since he had sex."

5. March 1989, in at Dr. Rasmussen's office, Dr. Rasmussen made a physical sexual advance toward student C. Student C stated, "The third night in Dr. Rasmussen and I were working with the data in his office when Dr. Rasmussen tried to fondle me. Dr. Rasmussen started to rub my upper leg so I crossed my legs. He then put his arm around me and tried to pull me towards him. When I resisted, Dr. Rasmussen tried to put his hand down my blouse. Throughout this, I continued to talk about the data and moved away from him. When I did get away from him, Dr. Rasmussen slapped his own hand and asked where we were. I was very frightened because it was after 11:00 p.m. and we were totally alone in the . Immediately after that, Dr. Rasmussen told me that he was a very influential person in and that he could make or break my career. I took this to mean that my career could be advanced if I had sex with Dr. Rasmussen or Dr. Rasmussen could hurt my career if I spoke about his sexual advance."
6. March 1989, in [redacted] at Dr. Rasmussen's home, Dr. Rasmussen touched student C's breast against her will. This incident took place a couple of days after the previous incident. In her sworn statement, Student C said, "Dr. Rasmussen, his wife, children and I were watching a video. His wife and oldest son went into the kitchen to get ice cream. When his wife was out of the room, Dr. Rasmussen started to rub my back and slide his hand across my breast. I immediately got up, stated I was going to bed and left the room."

7. April 1989, in [redacted] at Dr. Rasmussen's home, Dr. Rasmussen made a physical sexual advance toward an [redacted] employee who was in [redacted] for a presentation at the University [redacted]. Dr. Rasmussen invited the [redacted] employee to stay at his home. In recalling this incident, the [redacted] employee stated, "The night I was in [redacted] at Dr. Rasmussen, his wife, children and I went out for pizza at [redacted]' expense. Dennis and I each had one or two beers at the restaurant and when we returned to his home we each had another beer. I was comfortable drinking the beers and talking about the [redacted] programs in the living room. His wife said that she was taking the kids up stairs to go to bed. After Dennis' wife and kids were up stairs, Dennis turned off the lights. I asked him what he was doing and he said something like the lights were hurting his eyes. Dennis then came over to me, sat beside me, and put his arm around me. He started rubbing my back and shoulders and also started rubbing my leg. I knew that he was making a sexual advance and I pushed away from him but he held my leg. I immediately stood up and stated that I was going to bed." I went to my room and Dennis followed me. He asked if I needed anything and I replied no, and closed the door. I could hear him outside the door and in the hallway for several minutes. I felt trapped but waited in the room until I heard him go upstairs. I then went to the bathroom and immediately returned to my room. Because I was not sure what Dennis would do and the bedroom door would not lock, I could hardly sleep at all that night. Early the next morning, I just wanted to leave and declined to have breakfast. When I left his house, Dennis followed me to my car and told me that it was too difficult to give me directions and would ride with me for a few blocks. He did and when I stopped the car to let him out, he hugged me and kissed me on the lips. I turned my head and said goodbye. I just wanted him out of the car."

8. May 1989, in [redacted] at Dr. Rasmussen's office, Dr. Rasmussen grabbed and kissed Student D. Student D was a NSF Scholarship student under Grant No. [redacted] from the summer 1988. Student D went to [redacted] at Dr. Rasmussen's request to work with Dr. Rasmussen on the data base for her research paper, which was required as part of the NSF Scholarship. After working with the data, Dr. Rasmussen invited Student D back to his home for dinner. According to Student D's statement, "Dennis's wife stayed with the kids in the kitchen while Dennis took me into the
I living room to eat. Dennis sat beside me on the couch and kept touching my shoulders and knees. A couple of times he touched my knee then slid his hand up my thigh. I was very anxious with his behavior and I had to get away from him. I told him that my friends were waiting for me and that I had to go."

9. Student D continued: "Dennis then walked me back to the so I could get my stuff. While at the Dennis grabbed me and started kissing me. He caught me off guard and frightened me. I froze and just did not react at all. This made him stop and he let me go. I told him that I had to leave and left immediately. This incident upset me so deeply that I cried when I left the ."

10. June 1989, in at Dr. Rasmussen's home, Dr. Rasmussen sexually assaulted TA#1. TA#1 was one of the five TAs who worked for with Dr. Rasmussen during the 1989 courses funded by Grant No 8900880. TA#1 met Dr. Rasmussen in to travel together to the field site in In her notarized statement, TA#1 stated, "On the second evening of my arrival in the United States, Dr. Rasmussen bought a bottle of tequila and made margaritas. We ate dinner with his family in the back garden. He became intoxicated. At the end of the evening on the way into the house he patted my bottom and slid his hand between my legs. This incident left me shocked, disappointed and angry. I was shocked that a man who had hired me to work for him, who had only known me for less than 48 hours, with whom I had three months ahead in the field, would attempt such a thing."

11. June 1989, while Dr. Rasmussen and the TAs were driving from to Dr. Rasmussen sexually assaulted TA #2. Early in the trip, Dr. Rasmussen and TA#2 were alone in the back of the truck while three other TAs were in the front of the truck. In her sworn statement TA#2 described this incident, "Dennis and I were just talking when Dennis tried to talk me into having sex with him right there in the back of the truck. I politely refused his offer several times hoping to end the matter and not make future situations with Dennis uncomfortable. This was a mistake, as he then crawled on top of me and tried to physically force me to kiss him. Fortunately, at this point, the driver of the truck pulled off the highway and Dennis stopped his advance."

12. June 1989, while Dr. Rasmussen and the TAs were traveling through en route to Dr. Rasmussen had sexual intercourse with TA#2 against her will. In her sworn statement, TA#2 stated, "We were really wired from drinking coffee and driving straight through so Dennis suggested that we drink some beer to help us sleep. Dennis, (TA#3), and I drank a few beers and talked and laughed while in the back of the truck. After a while we decided to go to sleep. I felt safe with (TA#3) back there with Dennis and me. Minutes later, I felt Dennis
moving around then he put his arms around me and pressed his body against mine. I resisted his sexual advances by trying to remove his arms and pushing him away. I was quietly trying to stop Dennis without waking (TA#3). He ignored my resistance and held my arms down and pressed me against the cab window. After he had me trapped, Dennis pulled up my skirt, pulled my underwear to the side, and forced his penis inside of me. This all happened so quickly that I was shocked. I didn't even know that Dennis had his penis out of his pants. I couldn't believe this was happening and just froze. Dennis is very strong and held me so that I couldn't move. I didn't know what to do so I just froze. I did not yell or scream. I just hoped that (TA#3) and the other TAs did not know what was happening to me. I was so embarrassed because I just met these people. I remember looking out the window crying, thinking that this would end. It seemed like it went on for ever but it did end quickly. After it ended, everyone just laid there while we continued to drive. I was devastated and extremely embarrassed. I felt really stupid and it just really freaked me out. I just tried to ignore it. I was incapable of addressing what had just happened to me. I refused to admit that Dennis raped me. He forcibly had sex with me without my consent but I couldn't bring myself to acknowledge this at that time. I think I was in some kind of shock."

While describing the incident, TA#3, who witnessed this incident, stated, "Dennis was in the middle between (TA#2) and I when we settled to take a nap. Both (TA#2) and I had our backs to Dennis. About five minutes later, I felt movement and turned over to see Dennis having intercourse with (TA#2). I was shocked and angry but had no idea what to do. (TA#2) was still lying with her back to Dennis and was totally unresponsive to what was happening to her."5

13. June and July 1989, in [BLANK] at the field site, Dr. Rasmussen actively pursued and had a consensual sexual relationship with TA#2. Dr. Rasmussen was in a position of supervision over TA#2. In addition, Dr. Rasmussen told TA#2 that he was going to leave his wife and that he wanted TA#2 and himself to be a couple and do great research together. When describing the relationship, TA#2 said, "I think that I participated in the relationship just to try to persuade myself that I had not been raped."

5 The witness statements which describe this incident are detailed and mutually supporting. In addition, this incident is strikingly similar in method and location to the way in which Rasmussen attempted to force himself upon another witness six months earlier, adding further force to the probity of this testimony. (See Incident 1.)
14. August 1989, in the field site. After TA#2 ended the sexual relationship with Dr. Rasmussen, Dr. Rasmussen threatened TA#2 and made two sexual advances toward her. In her sworn statement, TA#2 stated, "Dennis also came into my tent twice at 4:30 in the morning, after my tent mate, (TA#3), had gone to the island. Both times he threatened me by insisting that I would never work again in if I didn't tell the right story. The first time he threatened me he had a crazy look in his eyes and he yelled at me until I was crying hysterically. I was terribly frightened and feared that he would physically harm me. After he got me hysterical, he made a sexual advance towards me, but I was crying so hard that he just stopped and left the tent. The second time he threatened me, I stood up in my tent and screamed at him to leave after he again tried to forcibly have sex with me."

15. August 15, 1989, in Dr. Rasmussen was intoxicated and made a physical sexual advance toward student E. After the generators at the field site broke down, Dr. Rasmussen moved most of the students and TA#4 to town so the students could finish their end of course papers. Dr. Rasmussen rented two rooms. All the beds were pushed together in one room and the computers were placed in the second room. Student E stated, "That night I had been working on my paper in the computer room. Dennis was out on the balcony with some of the students drinking shots of tequila. I finished my paper late and went to bed. All the beds were pushed together and I got into bed beside another girl. I was only in bed a couple of minutes when Dennis came in and got in bed beside me. Dennis put his arm around me and started rubbing my back and playing with my hair. I took this as a sexual advance and asked him what he was doing. He didn't respond to my question so I got out of bed and returned to the computer room. He didn't say anything to me when I left. It was very late and other people were still working on their papers so I just stayed up the rest of the night. The next morning I saw Dennis and an older student, (Student F), asleep holding each other. A lot of other people saw Dennis and (Student F) together and were talking about them." Student E reported Dr. Rasmussen's sexual advance to the TAs.

16. August 15, 1989, in Dr. Rasmussen had some sexual activity, but not intercourse with student F, a NSF Scholarship student under Grant No After being rejected by student E, Dr. Rasmussen moved next to student F, who was also in bed and somewhat receptive to his advances. TA#4 and several students witnessed Dr. Rasmussen and student F sleeping together and lying in a huddle during the night and the next morning.

In her sworn statement, TA#4 stated, "(student F) stated that she enjoyed the sexual activity with Rasmussen and that Rasmussen had told her she would earn the highest grade in the course. (Student F)'s academic achievements were indeed commendable, but
in my opinion, several of the other students deserved higher grades on the basis of their performances on exams, on individual research projects, and in the field." A review of records show that Dr. Rasmussen did give Student F the highest grade in that class.

TA#1 confronted Dr. Rasmussen after she had learned of his sexual advances toward Student E and Student F. In her notarized statement, TA#1 stated, "Once again, I was furious with Dr. Rasmussen and immediately approached him with the two incidents. He replied that these students were his friends and besides, that he could have relationships with students if he wanted to, pointing out that he married a student. I told him that he left me no choice but to report him and that if he could at least realize that he was hurting people."

17. August 16, 1989, in Dr. Rasmussen made a sexual advance toward TA#5. After the TAs were told about Dr. Rasmussen's behavior of the previous night, they called to report Dr. Rasmussen's behavior and moved all the female students to a separate hotel. That night, TA#5 went back to the computer room to insure that no students were left behind before going to dinner. In her sworn statement, TA#5 stated, "I found Dennis drunk in the hall. Dennis pushed and coaxed me onto the balcony where there was a shot glass and a bottle of tequila that was almost empty. I later heard that he had been drinking shots in front of everyone following the completion of the students' oral presentations. Dennis said that he wanted to have a drink with me and I told him that we were taking the students out to dinner and that he should join us. Dennis held up a piece of cheese and said that he and I should go up on the roof alone and drink beer and eat the cheese. He put his arm around me and said that even though we had trouble with each other over the summer that we were a lot alike and could do great research together. He was rubbing my shoulder and I knew that he was making a sexual advance toward me. I was concerned for my well being because we were alone and he is much bigger than I." Dr. Rasmussen would not let TA#5 go until TA#3 found them on the balcony and removed TA#5 from the situation.
ATTACHMENT 2
SUBJECT INTERVIEW

On May 3, 1990, Special Agent [REDACTED] of OIG interviewed Dr. Dennis Rasmussen at his office at the [REDACTED] Deputy US Marshall. The interview that started at 1:00 p.m. and ended at approximately 4:30 p.m. The following is a description of that interview.

During the interview, I completed six pages of handwritten notes. When I had completed the first page of notes, I read my notes to Dr. Rasmussen and made changes to the notes when Dr. Rasmussen corrected me. I then asked Dr. Rasmussen to read that first page of notes and sign the page showing that he agreed with what I had written. Dr. Rasmussen read the notes but refused to sign the page at that time. Every time I completed another page of notes, I read the notes to Dr. Rasmussen and made changes when he corrected me. The following is a summary of that interview.

When asked about consuming alcohol during the 1989 courses in [REDACTED], Dr. Rasmussen denied ever getting intoxicated and stated that he did drink beer at the goodbye parties while in [REDACTED].

When I asked Dr. Rasmussen if he ever had sexual relations with staff or students, Dr. Rasmussen refused to answer the question. Dr. Rasmussen did state, "All my relationships were in good taste."

I then asked Dr. Rasmussen if he ever used his position or authority to develop a relationship with students or teaching assistants. Dr. Rasmussen claimed that he always did everything he could to impress students and staff that he did not use power to develop relationships. Dr. Rasmussen stated, "I can honestly say that I never used my position to develop a relationship with student or staff." I then asked if he would give a sworn statement to this. Dr. Rasmussen Responded, "I would give a sworn statement to this. I have never used power in this way, except knowledge. Knowledge is power."

I asked Dr. Rasmussen why someone would say that he had sexual relations with them. Dr. Rasmussen responded, "There have been students and staff who came on to me but I always rejected their advances. I had a student come up to me and say, 'I want to fuck your eyes out,' but I always had to stop this. Life was complex enough in the field to add this."

I then asked Dr. Rasmussen if he had a sexual relationship with (TA#2). Dr. Rasmussen responded, "I don't need to answer that.
question." When asked if he had sex with (TA#2) in the truck on the way to __ and Dr. Rasmussen again refused to answer, saying that the question was covered under his previous statement. I then asked Dr. Rasmussen if he raped (TA#2). Dr. Rasmussen laughed, then said, "Absolutely not." I told Dr. Rasmussen that (TA#2) had provided a sworn statement saying that he did rape her. Dr. Rasmussen said that (TA#2)'s statement was a lie.

I then asked Dr. Rasmussen if he made a sexual advance toward (Student D), an NSF student from 1988, who came to his office to work on the field data. Dr. Rasmussen denied making a sexual advance toward Student D. I explained that Student D had signed a sworn statement in which she stated that Dr. Rasmussen had grabbed her and kissed her. Dr. Rasmussen denied grabbing or kissing Student D and stated that her statement was incorrect.

Next, I asked Dr. Rasmussen if he ever made a sexual advance toward Student A. Dr. Rasmussen denied making a sexual advance toward Student A. When I told Dr. Rasmussen that Student A provided a sworn statement claiming that he sexually assaulted her during their trip to __ and that he made sexual advances toward her while in __, Dr. Rasmussen said, "I like (Student A) but not that way. (Student A) was the student who said she wanted to fuck my eyes out. I did not make a sexual advance towards her." Dr. Rasmussen added, "(Student A) is a bit of an alcoholic. She came to my tent drunk as a skunk and said these things to me."

I then asked Dr. Rasmussen if he made sexual advances toward Students E and Student F. Dr. Rasmussen denied making these sexual advances. I asked Dr. Rasmussen if he had been drinking tequila at the end of the course while in __ and Dr. Rasmussen again denied drinking tequila. I told Dr. Rasmussen that Student E gave me a sworn statement that stated she witnessed him drinking tequila and that Dr. Rasmussen made sexual advances toward her. I added that TA#4, who stated that she was treated fairly and as a colleague by Dr. Rasmussen, stated in her sworn statement that she had witnessed Dr. Rasmussen drink tequila on that night and saw him and Student F sleeping and holding each other the next morning. Dr. Rasmussen still denied that these things took place.

Dr. Rasmussen denied threatening the TAs with academic sanctions or professional blacklisting. When I asked Dr. Rasmussen why all these people would give statements against him, Dr. Rasmussen responded, "I was the person being taken advantage of during 89. The TA's ganged up on me. I needed another person to act as an authority figure. I needed another professional person there with me for my protection."
Dr. Rasmussen then began to ramble on that he was the victim and people were out to get him. He stated that he was the one who needed to be protected and that he was being ganged up on. When I asked him what he meant by this, Dr. Rasmussen responded that some of the people involved in the 89 courses were not what they claimed to be. I then asked Dr. Rasmussen what he thought these people were. He responded that they might have been CIA or FBI. I asked him if he was talking about the students and the TAs. Dr. Rasmussen responded yes and added that there were bigger things going on there then just science and education. I attempted to get Dr. Rasmussen to elaborate on this. He refused to elaborate but added things are not what they seem because those organizations (CIA and FBI) are always interested in what scientists are doing. When I started to write these statements, Dr. Rasmussen stopped me. He said that he didn't think I should write these things down and he didn't want them in his statement.

I then asked Dr. Rasmussen if he would like to use my six pages of notes as his statement since he had already agreed to the contents of the notes. I then let Dr. Rasmussen read the six pages of notes. Dr. Rasmussen did not make any changes to the notes but refused to sign the statement. He did request and I allowed him to keep a photocopy of the six pages of notes.
ATTACHMENT 3
INCIDENTS OF PROFESSIONAL BLACKMAIL

In sworn statements by TA#2, TA#3, TA#5, and the notarized statement by TA#1, it is documented that Dr. Rasmussen threatened these TAs with professional blacklisting and academic sanctions, including withholding the research data.

1. In her notarized statement, TA#1 describes an incident when she confronted Dr. Rasmussen about his behavior, "I heard (TA#2) crying, so I went to her tent. She informed me that she had told Dr. Rasmussen that she did not want to sleep with him anymore and that he had gotten extremely angry and called her a prostitute. He asked her if she was 'fucking' one of the men in town. He then said that she was just beginning her career and that he knew a lot of people so if she ever tried to stab him in the back, that he could 'bring her down so hard.' This made me furious. I immediately confronted Dr. Rasmussen pointing out that this was blackmail. I told him of all the cases I knew of when he had sexually harassed women and told him that I wanted to report him. He said he wanted to get this all sorted out before we returned to the United States. We went to his tent and went through every incident. He denied them all except what he had done to me in saying that 'we were friends and we were having a party.' I told him that I thought that he had raped (TA#2). He said that their relationship had been beautiful from the start. He compared their courtship to that of the stickleback. When I said (TA#2) also felt that she had been raped he wanted to talk to her so we went together to her tent. He asked her if she wanted to have sex with him in the back of the truck and she replied 'no'. He then got very angry and said "if you think you have shit on me, man do I have shit on you" and "don't expect for me to help you out if you go behind my back."

2. TA#2 stated, "Near the end of the second course, Dennis frequently asked me if I was hired by the FBI, CIA, and NSF to monitor him in the field. Also, Dennis constantly accused me of sleeping with other men and women and asked me if I was a prostitute. Dennis threatened me and other TAs with 'academic sanctions' if we reported his actions to or anyone else. He made it clear that, and I quote, 'he knew people in and that he would have us 'blacklisted' among professionals if we 'stabbed him in the back. Dennis told me that he would never release the data to (TA#5) and that she would never see the data. Dennis saw (TA#5) as an instigator."

3. TA#3 stated, "Dennis took each of the TAs aside to accuse us of a myriad of things. He told us that we would be blacklisted from or would not be allowed to work with him or the data. My first experience of this sort with Dennis lasted about
20 or 30 minutes. Dennis told me that he would make sure I would never work in [redacted] again. The most memorable quote from Dennis during this was, 'You are trying to play the female with me. If you try to dominate me, you will get nothing.' I took this to mean that I would not get any work in or be allowed to use the data from the project. My impression of Dennis during this time, was that he was a manipulative person who could not share knowledge for fear of losing control or power."

4. TA#1 and TA#5 confronted Dr. Rasmussen about sexual harassment and Dr. Rasmussen threatened them. TA#5 stated, "we confronted Dennis about the sexual harassment, Dennis commented that women were always coming on to him and he always has trouble with that. Dennis then threatened us by saying that he 'knew' people in [redacted]. I took this to mean that if we talked about his behavior, he would try to blackball us out of [redacted]."
These sworn statements by TA's and students who took the summer courses illustrate the control that Rasmussen exerted over the research data that were collected. They also illustrate how he used his control over the data to exert pressure on the students to accept his sexual advances. These sexual incidents are in addition to those described in Attachment 1, and directly exemplify research misconduct.

1. In her sworn statement, Student E stated, "Dennis controlled the data, I think that he was the only one who knew how to retrieve and analyze the data. He would pull the data up on the screen then tell us to read the data. Sometimes he would leave after bringing the data up and we couldn't interpret the data and he would[n't] be around. It would be a waste of time because we couldn't understand what we had. He would often take his time retrieving the data and ask us to go get him coffee or something to drink. We were at his mercy when getting data for our papers. All the charts and data that he would print out for me, I couldn't understand. The TAs couldn't understand the data either. Dennis was so busy by the end of the course that I just wrote my paper without using part of the data because I couldn't consult with him."

2. Student D, an NSF student from 1988 who returned to in 1989 to finish her research, stated, "Dennis did help us past students complete our analysis of the data. This took about two weeks. Dennis controlled the data and would only work with us when he had time. One of the female students from the past year really monopolized Dennis' time during this. This girl played the flirt game with Dennis and Dennis spent a lot of time with her. That's the way Dennis worked with the data, if you flirted with him and let him touch you, you got more accomplished. Since I wanted to keep my distance from him, I did not compete for his attention so I could get more computer time. It was really like there was a competition for his attention and he was really high on himself because of this competition. Dennis would not let the females work alone with the data because he was the only one who knew how to use the computer program. It was like Dennis had us on a string. He would string us along, working a little here then working more later. Dennis had total control of everything, including who would go to town in his truck and he would use this as a basis for displaying his favoritism. Since there was many more females that males, there was this little game that you had to be nice to Dennis."

3. Student A, who worked for Dr. Rasmussen from February 1987 to June 1989 and was a student in the first course in 1989, stated, "Dennis also controlled all access to any of the data.
Dennis taught us how to upload the data into the system but never taught us how to use the statistical program to analyze the data. The way Dennis set things up, he was the only person who could run the statistical analysis and he used this to control who had access to the data and how the data was used. I worked with Dennis for over two years and he never taught me how to run the statistical program. Dennis played favoritism toward the prettier female students by spending more time working with them on the computer. By doing this Dennis neglected other students and this affected their final paper and their overall understanding of the research. Most students noticed these displays of favoritism and this was widely talked about during the course. One of the female students came to (TA#1) and expressed her concern over Dennis' sexual suggestions while working on the computers, which placed her in an uncomfortable situation as his student. Often in the computer room he would touch us females by rubbing our backs and putting his hands on our knees. This made a very tense working environment and many of the students would feel uncomfortable about working with Dennis on the computers.

4. TA#5 stated, "Dennis was the only one who knew how to use the computer system to analyze the data. Dennis showed everyone how to use the computer but never took the time to teach anyone how to use the computer for data analysis. As a result, all of the students had to come to Dennis to analyze data for their papers. The students did not analyze the data, Dennis did this for the students and then gave the students the results. Some of the students complained that Dennis did not distribute his time equally among all students."

5. TA#4 stated, "Rasmussen controlled the data once it went into the computer. None of us, the TAs, could help the students substantially in the analysis of the data with the computer. We did not have the time or experience to work with the analysis of the data at the level Rasmussen could. The negative aspect of this is that Rasmussen controlled who spent time analyzing the data and decided which statistical test were appropriate for each student's project. Rasmussen would run the test and then print out the results for the students. Rasmussen clearly spent more time working with some students and less time with other students. During the first course, Rasmussen spent an enormous amount of time with a very attractive female student. I did not see any soliciting from this female student but it was very apparent that Rasmussen decided to spend a disproportionate amount of time with this single student. Rasmussen neglected other students who requested his assistance and continued to work with this female student. The varying amounts of time Rasmussen spent with different students affected the quality of individual students' final projects in ways that were beyond the students' control."
In her sworn statement, TA\#4 added, "Another aspect of inequality of time spent with students happened during the beginning of the second course. Several of Rasmussen's previous students came to work with the data with Rasmussen. Rasmussen spent excessive amounts of time with the data with these students to the exclusion of students participating and paying tuition for the second course. One of his past female students solicited Rasmussen's help in a flirtatious manner and Rasmussen would immediately respond to her request, including once interrupting a lecture to assist this female student."

6. TA\#3 stated, "Also during this time, Dennis was to teach us how to use SPSS, the statistical package for the computers. Dennis did briefly show us the use of the computer but never really taught us how to use it. He would not provide the students or us with material, such as the commands, to fully use the computer. Whenever we had a problem with the computer, we had to go to Dennis for help. Dennis would never teach us how to correct the problem; he would just do it for us. This slowed the process because everyone had to go to Dennis for work on the computer. By controlling access to the data through use of the computers, Dennis showed favoritism towards certain students by spending more time with some students while ignoring the needs of other students. Several students spoke to us about the amount of time and attention that Dennis gave certain students."

"Dennis' favoritism towards certain students got worse during the second course. Dennis especially gave a lot of attention towards students of his past courses who came to work with Dennis on research. One of his past students, Tina, would even interrupt Dennis' lectures for him to help her on the computers. Dennis would leave the lecture and neglect the students who he was supposed to be teaching to help. Many of the students were angry because Dennis spent more time with past students. These students felt cheated by Dennis. During this second course, I noticed that Dennis spent more time with females who were receptive of his advances than with students who would not play his flirtatious games. Dennis continued to control access to the data based on his favoritism towards certain students."

7. TA\#2 stated, "Dennis controlled the data. The staff and students could input data into the computer but could not use the computer to analyze the data. Dennis would never take the time to sufficiently teach anyone how to use SPSS to analyze the data. Dennis spent all of his time at the computers. Dennis controlled the data because he was the only one who could use the computer to analyze the data, therefore, the students would have to come to him to work with the data. The student would sit next to Dennis as the computer while Dennis did the analysis. The student would never know what Dennis was doing. He would just do the analysis then provide them with the results of the analysis."
"Another way he controlled the data is that Dennis spent a disproportionate amount of time with some students while neglecting others. During the first course, Dennis spent an enormous amount of time with (Name), a student who Dennis said was attractive. Most students noticed this and complained, but Dennis would ignore or deny these complaints. Another incident when Dennis neglected students was during the second course. Three of Dennis' past students came to during the break but did not start working with Dennis until the second course began. Dennis completely ignored the students in the second course and worked with the past students on their computer analysis. Most of the students noticed this and made comments. This was extremely unfair to the students of the second course who expected his participation and assistance. Dennis put a lot of pressure on students to start and complete projects but would not be available a sufficient amount of the time to complete the projects. Often, the projects were of unreasonable length in terms of the data analysis."
1. Student D, an NSF student from 1988, described the effects of the project in her sworn statement. "... This experience with Dennis gave me a very negative feeling about research. I thought that you had to play games and flirt to get anything accomplished in research. Working with Dennis made it very difficult for me to finish my NSF project and took way too long to complete because of him. Dennis was constantly revising the ways to analyze the data for my idea but I didn't know what he was doing. The course, especially collecting the data was a very good educational experience but I do not think I learned anything from working with Dennis after the course. I had never had a teacher make a sexual advance towards me before Dennis. Now I'm much more guarded around male professors. I do not want to be associated with Dennis Rasmussen and would never work with him again. I'm afraid that by giving this statement, other researchers will see me as some kind of trouble maker. I want to give this statement because after hearing other female students about what Dennis has done and after what he did to me, I do not want any other female students to have this kind of experience while working in education and research. It has been very hard for me to come forward and talk about this."

2. In her sworn statement, Student C described the effects of working with Dr. Rasmussen, "My research was delayed an enormous amount of time because of Dr. Rasmussen would not release the data to me. If he would have released the data in 1988 and 1989 like he just did in the beginning of June 1990, I would have not had to go to him and be the subject of his sexual advances and I would have completed my research long ago. By limiting my access to the data, Dr. Rasmussen had controlled my actions, especially my trip to __ and the delay of my research. In addition, Dr. Rasmussen attempted to use the data and his position as professor to influence me to have sex with him. The experience of working with Dr. Rasmussen has made me leery of working closely with other male researchers. Finally, I feel that Dr. Rasmussen's actions have hindered and delayed my career."

3. In her sworn statement, TAJ3 stated, "Because of Dr. Rasmussen's completely inappropriate and unprofessional behavior, I refused to work with him or the data after returning from __. The two things that I wanted to learn during the project, that is the computer and statistical analysis, I did not learn. In addition, this took up much valuable time that I could have used more productively to advance my education and career. This has also taken a great deal of my personal time and
emotional energy since returning from This experience has made me more aware of sexual harassment and I feel that there is no place in the education and scientific environment for this type of behavior."

4. TA#2, who asserted that Dr. Rasmussen raped her, stated, "Because of what had happened to me, and the completely unprofessional and inappropriate behavior of Dennis, and because of the complete lack of integrity in the data, I refused to have anything to do with the data and Dennis Rasmussen. Also because of this experience, I had to seek counselling when I returned to This has affected my academic work during the past year because of my involvement. This has been very time consuming as well as mentally traumatic. It has affected my professional career because I have been fearful to go into the field with other male researchers. I have passed up research opportunities because of my fears."