

**Part 8.**

**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:**

**Question: Now, you say: Dr. DePree provided me with the transcript of a recent Federal Court proceeding? [The sworn testimony in the transcript included several faculty who contradicted DePree's accusers.]**

**Cannon: Uh-huh (affirmative).**

**Question: Did you read that court proceeding?**

**Cannon: Parts of it. It was rather lengthy.**

**Question: What in the Federal Court proceeding did you review?**

**Cannon: Probably the first three pages and the last three pages.**

**Question: Do you believe you gave it proper consideration in your report?**

**Cannon: Yes.**

**Question: What was the basis for that decision not to completely review the document?**

**Cannon: Relevance, you know, if I thought that there was anything –**

**Question: How would you know if it was relevant or not if you didn't read it all?**

**University attorney interrupted.**

**We cannot help but wonder,**

- (1) Did Dr. Cannon deliberately ignore sworn testimony that contradicted his conclusions or what the faculty told him?**
- (2) Was he too lazy to review the document? or**
- (3) Had he predetermined what his conclusions would be and didn't want waste time reading the testimony?**

**When your job is on the line, is this the due process you can expect for yourself?**