

Part 14.

Questions directed to Ombudsman Gordon Claude Cannon at his deposition on April 16, 2010 about his investigation of Professor DePree: Q. Did you ask if there were people within the college who might have a different perspective than the [DePree's accusers] people you talked to?

A. I asked Dr. DePree that, yes, I did.

Q. And what was his response?

A. He told me there were two names ... I think when we interviewed, he gave me the names of two people who might have a different perspective.

Q. Did you talk to them?

A. I didn't.

Q. Why not?

A. At that point, ... we were running -- you know, this was beginning to run long, and we wanted to get it finished up.

Q. Dr. Cannon, we're talking about a potential recommendation for termination [of a tenured full professor]?

A. Yeah....

Q. And you chose not to talk to them? Why didn't you contact them? ... [DePree] provided you with the testimony [of faculty who provided evidence contrary to DePree's accusers], did he not?

A. I don't know when that testimony came up. That testimony maybe came up even after I had met with him [DePree]. I'm not sure.

Q. Did you have it when you issued your report?

A. Yeah, I did.

Q. So you were aware of it and had access to it?

A. Yes.

Q. And you chose not to thoroughly review it?

A. Yes.

Gordon Cannon was reluctant to make this admission. It took the cross-examining attorney a while to extract an answer. Why was he so reluctant to provide this information? Was he embarrassed about how ineptly he had conducted an investigation as an ombudsman who was charged with recommending whether a tenured full professor should be fired?

If your career is on the line, will Dr. Cannon or someone like him, find it too much trouble to contact witnesses who are unlikely to support the conclusion the ombudsman wants to reach? Dr. Cannon claims to be a scientist. Surely, he understands that a scientist should consider all available information – not just that which confirms his biases.