

To KNAW-LOWI
https://www.knaw.nl/en/topics/ethiek/landelijk-orgaan-wetenschappelijke-integriteit-lowi
Official Secretary LOWI, ///////////////
P.O. Box 19121
1000 GC Amsterdam

February 27, 2014

Concerning: TU Delft JZ-UIT-2917 d.d. 17 FEB 2014 w.r.t. LOWI case 2013/5643

Dear dr. //////////////,

Thank you for sending me the reply of TU Delft JZ-UIT-2917 d.d. 17 FEB 2014 w.r.t. this case, and for giving me an opportunity to comment.

- (1) It is not clear to me whether the Rector Magnificus has asked advice from the complaint committee itself. His letter indicates kindly that you can get more information from the secretary of the complaint committee mr. //////////////, but the letter itself refers to mr. ////////////// as the contact person. There is no appendix with a reaction by the complaint committee on the appeal to LOWI. I would hope that the complaint committee had been involved in a reaction to my appeal to LOWI. Currently, my impression is that the case has been handled in direct legal fashion.
- (2) In my letter to you of November 29 2013 I provided additional information of the events after the "review" was published in 2012 and my complaint of July 7 2012, also outside of TU Delft. This was intended to provide context.
The "Regeling wetenschappelijke integriteit TU Delft" contains the option for a fast resolution. In the "Toelichting" of "Artikelen 11, 12, 13": "In elk stadium van de klachtenprocedure kan de procedure worden stopgezet als er een oplossing wordt gevonden waarmee de klager genoegen neemt. Hierdoor wordt een snelle en informele afhandeling van klachten mogelijk." TU Delft (and its complaint committee) could have used this information on context to resolve the case faster. For example, the comments by dr. Boudri on the "review" might have helped. But TU Delft choose the legal position that they only consider my original complaint of July 7 2012. The Rector Magnificus thus neglects the additional information on context. I don't think that this legal attitude is proper in issues of scientific integrity.
- (3) The reaction by the Rector Magnificus is straightforward. The complaint committee in 2012 looked at page 6 of the LOWI Notitie of 2001 and copied the division in three categories there: fabrication, deception, theft. They decided that a "claimed slanderous review" doesn't fall in these categories. They also comment subsidiarily that dissent is common in science, and that I have used ways to voice my reaction. With an ungrounded case, they saw no reason to hear me. Thus, they neglected that my letter of July 7 2012 explicitly referred to LOWI notitie 2001 page 7: "Het hoofdpunt is: "bewust verkeerd of tendentius weergeven van resultaten en onderzoekverslagen van anderen"". The Rector Magnificus just restates this neglect.

My book *Conquest of the Plane* deals with the empirical science of didactics of mathematics, which differs from abstract mathematics itself. Currently, many pupils in school can experience stress when mathematics is explained to them in traditional fashion. My criticism and alternative meet with slander of my person. Another person than me and a mathematician judged that dr. J. Spandaw of TU Delft apparently is a traditionally minded mathematician. He is a trainer of mathematics teachers but then apparently belongs to my target readers who show insufficient understanding of didactics. His reaction is to slander, but this is a false reaction. The slander needs to be corrected.

Kind regards,

drs Thomas Cool MSc
Econometrician (Groningen 1982) and teacher of mathematics (Leiden 2008)

////////// Scheveningen

Tel. //////////

////////// <http://thomascool.eu>