

We continue a series recounting what a number of readers have characterized as misconduct and stupidity of past and current University of Southern Mississippi faculty and administrators. The facts underlying these conclusions have been fully documented. When one reader suggested this series, he opined “before someone comes to Southern Miss as a student or puts a career on the line as faculty member, “Ethics, Power and Academic Corruption” should be required reading.” The eighth installment follows. (See, the [first](#), [second](#), [third](#), [fourth](#), [fifth](#), [sixth](#), [seventh](#) and [eighth](#) installments here.)

## **Colleagues’ Expectations**

The AACSB advocates ethical standards and offers advice to its member institutions worldwide. For example, it encourages deans to:

think of themselves as ethical leaders who communicate regularly about ethics, values; who model ethical conduct: and who hold community members—faculty, staff, and students—accountable for their actions.

(2004, 12. [http://www.aacsb.edu/resource\\_centers/EthicsEdu/default.asp](http://www.aacsb.edu/resource_centers/EthicsEdu/default.asp). Last accessed March 2010.)

The AACSB also promotes itself as an accreditor that:

represents the highest standards of achievement for business schools, worldwide. Institutions that earn accreditation confirm their commitment to quality and continuous improvement...

([www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/](http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/). Last accessed March 2010.)

Therefore, its accredited members are expected to follow standards including ethics principles and “integrity in the representations of information about programs and the institution.” (AACSB 2007, 27 and AACSB 2010, 28.

<http://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/maintenance/Maintenance-Handbook-Revised-March42010.pdf>. Last accessed, March 2010.)

Such public representations encouraged colleagues to ask the AACSB to advise the involved faculty and USM administrators to join them in a dialogue to assess whether the USM’s copies of other schools’ “Guidelines” and “Academic Integrity Policy” were instances of plagiarism and learn the parameters of plagiarism. Colleagues’ expectations at the time were reinforced by a view of accreditation that was later publicly expressed by Professor A. Lee Fritschler (2007):

The traditional role of accreditors has been to work with institutions to help them correct deficiencies uncovered in the review process.

So, whether the questionable documents were indeed “deficiencies,” the AACSB seemed to be an appropriate venue to advance a dialogue about whether the documents constituted plagiarism. Clearly, the AACSB was already involved as recipient of the questionable documents....