

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 twentieth installment follows. (See, the [first](#), [second](#), [third](#), [fourth](#), [fifth](#), [sixth](#), [seventh](#), [eighth](#), [ninth](#), [tenth](#), [eleventh](#), [twelfth](#), [thirteenth](#), [fourteenth](#), [fifteenth](#), [sixteenth](#), [seventeenth](#), [eighteenth](#) and [nineteenth](#) installments here.)

What USM and AACSB Actually Do

USM and AACSB representations advocating diversity are promises. Their actual practice, however, must be observed and the observations documented. A brief summary of their actual practices is provided as an overview before the detailed documentary evidence is presented (Also, see Part 1.):

The Chairman of USM’s Accreditation Committee emailed to CoB’s faculty documents that were destined for submission to the AACSB. Several faculty noticed documents were copied without citation. Some faculty, informally at first, then in accordance with USM’s Faculty Handbook, asked administrators and involved faculty why the documents were copied without citation. The College’s administrators and involved faculty ignored the inquiries. USM administrators denied there were procedures to investigate apparent plagiarism. Instead, they sent the faculty, including this researcher, to consult with the Director of USM’s Office of Affirmative Action and Equal Employment Opportunity.

CoB administrators later submitted the questionable documents to the AACSB in satisfaction of accreditation standards. Several faculty believed AACSB should be informed of the questionable nature of the documents. Evidence that the documents were copied “without proper citation” was offered to AACSB in accordance with its procedures. AACSB characterized the evidence as a “complaint.” Although AACSB’s characterization is used here, the communications and documents are more accurately identified as information and a request for a dialogue.

AACSB decided the plagiarized documents did not violate its standards. However, a freedom of information request revealed a document that an AACSB official warned against this decision. Subsequently, USM administrators suspended Researcher DePree from teaching and service for asking questions and offering the documents to the AACSB. Researcher DePree advised USM

administrators that they were in violation of its principles of diversity of thought, freedom of speech, and academic freedom. He also advised the AACSB of his suspension and asked it to consider the punishment as a violation of AACSB's standard of diversity. The AACSB refused. AACSB officials assisted USM administrators in punishing the Researcher DePree. They were resolved to protect and advance the right of USM faculty and administrators to plagiarize documents submitted to the AACSB in support of USM's reaccreditation.

Details and Documentation

The AACSB requires "complainants" to "(1) identify the specific accreditation standard(s) relevant to the complaint, (2) provide documentation that supports the complaint, and (3) identify the relationship of the complainant to the member school." (AACSB July 24, 2004.)

Researcher DePree identified himself to the AACSB as a "complainant." He stated that his relationship to the member school is a professor at the School of Accountancy, College of Business at the University of Southern Mississippi. He also specified the AACSB accreditation standards relevant to the complaint and provided documentation and evidence supporting the "complaint." (See the statement of AACSB standard above and documentation presented below.)...