

From: Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>

To: Justin Dillon <[REDACTED]>, Courtney Forrest <[REDACTED]>

Cc: Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>

Subject: suggested email to the Provost and Kevin Salcido.

Date: Wed, 05 Sep 2018 01:06:51 +0000

Hi.. Here are some emails I am thinking of sending. Since Kevin Salcido is Carla's boss I should have cc'd him originally anyway. But since he outlined the process in detail I think I should write him the letter below. I think I should write Mark with 2 questions, see my letter to him below, and attach my email to Kevin. I was a bit worried about antagonizing Mark, but I think the letters are polite and he has already decided to fuck me over anyway. So, thoughts?

First, suggested email to Kevin:

1. Dear Kevin:

On Oct 29th and 30th I sent two memos to Carla Mahnke listing new evidence related to the matter associated with the allegation of groping in Australia. The first bit of new evidence not only casts additional doubt on the claims of the chief witness in that event (and suggests that the second witness was not a witness at all). The second definitively shows that ASU did **not** support any of my travel to the Skeptics event, and obviates the claim that it was an ASU sponsored and supported event. As I indicated to Carla, I believe this new information warrants re-opening the matter as per your email to me of March 20th, from which I have extracted the relevant parts below. I haven't heard from Carla on this, and didn't know if she had forwarded my memos. Many thanks for your attention to this.

Lawrence Krauss

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Kevin Salcido (HR)"

Subject: RE: clarification - my commitment to the investigation

Date: March 20, 2018 at 4:50:06 PM PDT

To: Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>, Carla Mahnke <[REDACTED]>

Professor Krauss,

The Office of Equity and Inclusion reports up to me in my role as Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer for the University. I have received and read your emails from March 9, 19 and 20th noting your question on the basis for OEI to re-open its review of the complaint that was received last fall over alleged conduct at the 2016 Skeptics Conference in Australia.

.....When new information is received on a matter that was not previously available, OEI will re-open the matter so that a determination can be made on whether the original conclusion stands or if a different conclusion is warranted. (ACD 401 does not impose any time limitation on when complaints may be brought forward to that office.)

Second, suggested email to Mark Searle.

2. Mark,

Thanks for your email. I came away from it a bit confused about two items.

Item 1: Does this mean that the Dean is the "other party", i.e. the accuser, in this case as there is no complainant?

Item 6. I was confused by this answer and the process of re-opening the investigation. In your Sept 7th, 2017 email to me you say "While I realize that it's uncomfortable being the subject of an investigation, the process also protects you; you were cleared. Should any additional complaints regarding that episode come to us, we will simply indicate that", which suggests to me that I was the subject of an investigation, whose depth was only limited by the limited evidence at hand (given the Oct 6, 2017 memorandum report from Carla Mahnke at the OEI to you). First, I therefore don't understand the difference between investigation and inquiry, terms which you used interchangeably in that email. As you may recall, your email to me was the reason I was later surprised that the investigation was reopened in March as a result of precisely what you indicated I was protected from, namely additional complaints regarding that episode. When I wrote to the OEI about this concern, I received a memo back from Kevin Salcido, which I believe was clear on this matter. I attach an extract from it below.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Kevin Salcido (HR)"
Subject: RE: clarification - my commitment to the investigation
Date: March 20, 2018 at 4:50:06 PM PDT
To: Lawrence Krauss <[REDACTED]>, Carla Mahnke <[REDACTED]>

Professor Krauss,

The Office of Equity and Inclusion reports up to me in my role as Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer for the University. I have received and read your emails from March 9, 19 and 20th noting your question on the basis for OEI to re-open its review of the complaint that was received last fall over alleged conduct at the 2016 Skeptics Conference in Australia.

.....When new information is received on a matter that was not previously available, OEI will re-open the matter so that a determination can be made on whether the original conclusion stands or if a different conclusion is warranted. (ACD 401 does not impose any time limitation on when complaints may be brought forward to that office.)

I have written to Kevin Salcido for clarification about this issue as I had not heard back from Carla Mahnke about it. I am hoping he can further clarify why the new information I provided to Carla doesn't warrant reopening the investigation as per his March guideline, if indeed that is the case.

Thanks again for your attention to these issues.

Best

Lawrence

attachment: Letter to Salcido from item #1

EFTA01024377

Professor

School of Earth & Space Exploration and Physics Department
Arizona State University, P.O. Box 871404, Tempe, AZ 85287-1404
Research Office [REDACTED]

| twitter.com/lkrauss1 | www.lawrencemkrauss.com