Click here for more in this series.

PART 10

Next, consider additional facts and documentation offered to AACSB in a follow-up communication in support of the claim that there was no process for investigating allegations of faculty plagiarism at University:

- 4. Email from University Ombudsman, stating that "He [Vice President Cecil Burge] agrees [with the Ombudsman John Harsh] that we [University of Southern Mississippi] don't have such a person [to investigate plagiarism] on this campus."
- Emails to University Ombudsman John Harsh citing the Faculty Handbook: "...plagiarism or other misconduct in research or in any other scholarly or creative activity is strictly prohibited...Every student and University employee is responsible not only to abide by the highest standards of integrity and professional ethics themselves but also to report violations...Alleged breaches...are investigated promptly and fully..."

 And that "[p]arties having reasonable cause to believe that a University employee or student has committed an act of scholarly misconduct must first consult informally with the University Research Ombudsman."

The emails between USM Ombudsman John Harsh and Researcher Professor DePree supports representations that the Ombudsman Harsh met informally with Professor DePree and that he, Ombudsman Harsh, recommended, after meeting with Vice President Cecil Berge, Research Professor DePree see the EEOC officer.

6. Emails between the EEOC officer Rebecca Woodrick and Research

Professor DePree relate that the EEOC officer advised him that the EEOC

officer's duties did not include investigations of alleged plagiarism.

7. After some faculty and the researcher asked administrators and involved

faculty to discuss the documents that were copied without citation,

Professor Charles Jordan carried out the instruction of Dean Harold

Doty to obtain permission from the Harmon College of Business

Administration to copy their "Guidelines for Participating and Supporting

Faculty" "without proper citation." This was unknown to Research

Professor DePree and colleagues at the time. The document was obtained

only after an attorney interceded with a freedom of information request.

4.

After Vice President Cecil Burge advised Researcher Professor DePree that the University Ombudsman was John Harsh, Professor DePree had a preliminary discussion with Ombudsman Harsh in accordance with the guidance in The Faculty Handbook. Ombudsman Harsh consulted with Vice President Burge then advised

Professor **DePree** the following:

From: [ombudsman@university.edu]

Subject: RE: AACSB accreditation documents

Date: December 4, 2006 1:11:15 PM CST

To: Professor DePree

Hi Marc.

I had the opportunity to speak to [Vice President Cecil Burge] about an appropriate "ombudsman" for issues like this... He agrees that we don't have such a person on this campus. He suggested that I pass along to you that you might consider talking to the EEOC person on campus (EEOC person – phone 6-6618).

John Harsh"

In a follow-up email, Research Professor **DePree** advised Vice President **Burge** and Ombudsman **Harsh** why he had sought their guidance.

From: Research Professor Marc DePree [mailto:Researchprofesor@university.edu]

Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2006 02:30 PM

To: John Harsh

Subject: AACSB accreditation documents

John.

Let me give you the citations that I referred to that led me to seek advice through the procedures set out in The Faculty Handbook.

"7.3 SCHOLARLY INTEGRITY

The University is dedicated to the discovery and dissemination of truth in research and in all other scholarly and creative activities, whether University-sponsored or conducted individually by members of the academic staff, by administrative officers and staff, or by students. Hence plagiarism or other misconduct in research or in any other scholarly or creative activity is strictly prohibited. Every student and University employee is responsible not only to abide by the highest standards of integrity and professional ethics themselves but also to report violations when they are known or reasonably suspected to have occurred. Alleged breaches of scholarly integrity are investigated promptly and fully by the University and may lead to University administrative proceedings and disciplinary action through Scholarly Misconduct Proceedings." (The Faculty Handbook, January 2006, p. 50, emphasis added.)

"11.2 SCHOLARLY MISCONDUCT PROCEDURE

11.2.1 Initiating Allegations. Parties having reasonable cause to believe that a University employee or student has committed an act of scholarly misconduct must first consult informally with the University Research Ombudsman." (The Faculty Handbook, January 2006, p. 93)

Thanks again for taking the time to consider the apparent plagiarism in CoB's AACSB accreditation documents.

Marc DePree

6.

EEOC is not the proper venue for an investigation of alleged plagiarism and the EEOC person confirmed it in the following email.

"From: Rebecca Woodrick

Subject: AACSB accreditation documents Date: December 8, 2006 8:18:07 AM CST To: Research Professor Marc DePree

I'll cut to the chase: if asked I would not agree to review an investigation of plagiarism. Not my area of expertise.

Rebecca Woodrick (EEOC)"

7.

"From: Charles Jordan

Sent: Friday, December 01, 2006 2:41 PM To: **Harold Doty** and **George Carter**

Subject: FW: Re: Participating/supporting faculty

Dean Harold Doty and Professor George Carter,

Attached is my correspondence with Dean Joan Neal-Mansfield of the Harmon College of Business Administration, Central Missouri State University regarding permission to use CMSU's definitions in our reports. As you can see, I clearly asked permission to use the adopted maintenance reports without proper citation and Joan granted us permission. I sent her a reply thanking her and telling her a formal letter was not necessary since her email response would suffice.

Charles Jordan"