

Continuing Interest in USM and AACSB: Willful and Ongoing Failures of Integrity

A follow-up question (see, pbrown1991 below) to my comment on a *Chronicle of Higher Education* article was posted today. I offered a response. See it below. The article's title was "[Cheating Inadvertently](#)." An excellent article, by the way.

usmnews.net recently published an editorial entitled [USM and AACSB: Willful and Ongoing Failures of Integrity](#) reporting an original comment to "Cheating Inadvertently." Here's a follow up exchange.

pbrown1991 Marc DePree • 5 hours ago

Perhaps the [plagiarism] criteria aren't "hard-and-fast," but there are criteria, and sometimes they depend on the context. Accreditors are so directive about the language they want documents written in--in fact, we have a multi-page style sheet.

Marc DePree pbrown1991 • 4 hours ago

Not sure I'm following you. Let me offer a few ideas in the area I'm speculating you're observing. The AACSB could have/can still quite easily discuss the case in point. (See the cited article, above.) They refused. The AACSB has "boilerplate" for AACSB members, for example, what to say about being a member. They do not have "boilerplate" for the documents "copied without proper citation"--a term used in an email by one of the plagiarizers we got through open records requests.

At the outset, I believed what my colleagues were offering the AACSB was an opportunity to discuss an area of concern, an opportunity to participate in our/everyone's education. I knew at the outset that the AACSB's behavior would make an interesting case study. If they had chosen discussion and education, I would have published their laudatory behavior. I'm sure other business schools would have been interested. The AACSB chose to act contrary to its own principles and standards and I wrote/documented that behavior.

Try again, pbrown1991, if I missed your idea.

Marc