

## *Special Report Series*

# The Ghosts of Christmas 2010

Former CoB Dean in Hot Water Once Again

PART 7

In light of former CoB dean Harold Doty's litigation history, USMNEWS.net reporters periodically check the courts near where Doty lives and works. Recent documents [obtained from](#) the Smith County, Texas Court Clerk, indicate that Doty is once again likely headed back to court, this time in his capacity as [dean of business](#) at the University of Texas - Tyler. These documents indicate that former UT-T business student advisor, Karen St. John, is suing UT-T based on [actions largely taken](#) by Doty vis-à-vis St. John's employment. This is Part 7 in this series.

Shortly thereafter, Keech attempted to prevent St. John from participating in the class commencement ceremony, as is standard practice for the advisors, by accusing her of being late for commencement. St. John had arrived at that event at the customary and appropriate time for such events in the past, not having been told otherwise by her supervisor. The following Monday, December 21, 2010, Keech called St. John into her office regarding her "lateness" to the commencement and called her a liar. Defendant used that false accusation as one of the reasons to fire St. John.

By mid-December of 2010, St. John had become the target of a new bully (see part 6 in this series), *assistant professor* Kerri Keech, pictured below. At that time, Keech attempted to "prevent St. John from participating in the class commencement ceremony . . . by accusing [St. John] of being late for commencement." According to her complaint (see above), St. John arrived at the customary time for commencement.



*Kerri Keech*

Later, on 21-Dec-2010, Keech wanted further words with St. John about the commencement matter, calling St. John “a liar” in a face-to-face meeting in Keech’s UT-Tyler office. This accusation would, according to St. John’s court documents, form part of the basis for terminating her (St. John) later that same day (see insert below).

On that same afternoon, Defendant gave St. John a letter of intent to terminate her employment. One of the examples cited in the letter of intent to terminate mentioned a student complaint, but the student’s name had been redacted to prevent St. John from being able to fully refute the claims. Defendant allowed her less than twenty-four hours to submit a response, but denied her access to her office and computer. St. John had to work through the night to complete her response by the 10 a.m. deadline given to her. This unfair action was taken despite the fact that

St. John’s termination letter was delivered to her on 21-Dec-2010. It stated, in part, that a student had complained about St. John, however the student’s name “had been redacted,” and St. John was not able to refute the student’s so-called claims against her (St. John). UT-Tyler officials did, however, allow St. John 24 hours to submit a response to the “letter of intent to terminate,” but they denied, according to the complaint, access to her office and/or UT-Tyler computer to complete that response. According to her complaint, St. had to work through the night to meet the 10am deadline on 22-Dec-2010 that was set by UT-Tyler administrators. Clearly, as sources point out, Christmas of 2010 was not going to be a joyful one in St. John’s home.

Stay tuned to USMNEWS.net for part eight.