

Part 12.

Questions directed to Ombudsman Gordon Claude Cannon at his deposition on April 16, 2010 about his investigation of Professor DePree with the charge of recommending whether to terminate DePree's tenure and employment: Were you tasked to try to determine if there was truthfulness in those allegations [against Professor DePree] or not?

Cannon: I was not tasked to determine if every -- if those letters were true or not. I was tasked with determining if Dr. DePree had met the criteria required with those three or four levels of requirement for being dismissed, to recommend that to the president. That was what my task was.

Question: Whether or not he has -- whether or not it was -- whether or not the allegations warranted --

Cannon: Nope, nope.

Question: Tell me, please.

Cannon: I just told you. I was tasked with determining whether or not he had reached the level of malfeasance or if he performed malfeasance or inefficiency or whatnot to the extent to be recommended to be --[terminated].

Dear Dr. Cannon, how can you determine whether or not he [DePree] had reached the level of malfeasance to warrant your recommendation on termination, if you neglected to determine the truth of the accusations that served as motivation for your investigation?

“I [Cannon] was not tasked to determine...if those letters were true or not.”

However, as reported in part 11, Dr. Cannon testified very differently to substantially the same question:

“Was it your duty to, as an ombudsman, to verify and substantiate the allegations made [against DePree] in these letters?”

Cannon: Yes.”

How do we reconcile your contradictory comments, Dr. Cannon? Are we witnessing a charade? A charade is defined as “an absurd pretense intended to create a respectable appearance”?