

## Part 2

### Questions directed to President Martha Saunders at her deposition on April 12 and 13, 2010--Q is question; A is President Saunders' answer.

Q. You indicated you had not reviewed the depositions of the other defendants [Jackson, Munn, Jordan, Posey, Anderson, Pate, et al.]?

A. That's correct.

Q. Do you think those would be helpful to you in your understanding of this matter?

A. They maybe.

Q. And when did you plan to review them?

A. I don't know.

Q. And you've had what, a year and a half to review them?

A. Probably more than that.

Q. Did you ever entertain the notion that the allegations contained in those letters [from the other defendants she depended upon to punish DePree] might be false?

A. Yes.

Q. And what investigation did you undertake to confirm that the veracity of the allegations [in the letters]?

A. I called for an investigation by the ombudsman [which was completed in 2007—[see Series Gordon Cannon, Ombudsman](#)].

Q. Anything else?

A. No that was the first action.

Q. And you did not read the depositions [of the other defendants which contradicted their own allegations.]?

A. No.

Q. Did you ever take any steps to determine the allegations against Dr. DePree were true or false?

A. I called for an investigation by the ombudsman .

Q. Did the ombudsman tell you if the statements [in the allegations by DePree's accusers] were true or false?...

A. On the matter regarding an attempt to sabotage the re-accreditation of SAIS by AACSB, he [ombudsman] indicated that he couldn't determine whether it was his [DePree's] intent to sabotage. But I'm paraphrasing here that he -- but the result could have been that and he did say this could conceivably interfere with the university's to obtain research funding or biased acceptance by peer research funding.

Q. I think you indicated that his [Ombudsman Cannon's] statement says he's been accused of, he may have, he could have?

A. Uh-huh (affirmative).

Q. What further action did you take to confirm or disconfirm?

A. None.

Q. Anything else in here where the ombudsman confirmed or was unable to confirm the truthfulness of the statements [by DePree's accusers]?

A. Well, the next item has to do with being accused of being disruptive and of creating an atmosphere that is not conducive to learning.

Q. Yes?

A. And he went on to say that such actions as placing fliers in a colleague's class without his or her permission is undoubtedly disruptive to teaching effort and completely unacceptable behavior.

Q. Let me stop you there?

A. All right.

Q. Dr. Cannon confirm that Dr. Depree had actually done this?

A. Well, that's the implication.

Q. Did he confirm it or did he just say he was told this?

A. Has been reported to place fliers. There is no confirmation...

Q. Was he able to confirm Dr. Depree's volatile temper?

A. Impossible to substantiate.

Q. Was he able to confirm that Dr. Depree had ever threatened anybody?

A. (Witness looks at document.) I don't see that.

Q. You don't see it?

A. I mean, I don't see his confirming that.

Q. In fact, he says that no faculty member told me [Ombudsman Cannon] that Dr. Depree had ever threatened them in in anyway?

A. What line is that.

Q. It's paragraph four, line one, two, three, four -- toward the end of the fourth line?

A. Correct.

Q. And you did not again, read the depositions of the witnesses?

A. I did not.

Q. Do you think reading those depositions would have been helpful?

A. They may have been.

Q. Anything else in here where Dr. Cannon was able to confirm the allegations contained in the letters?

A. That is the end of those points.

When your career is on the line, will Dr. Saunders ignore evidence so that she can punish you for speech or any other behavior she and/or others don't like? Of course, if Dr. Saunders ignores evidence that does not support the conclusions she wants to reach, she can continue to punish any of us while Mississippi taxpayers pick up the tab.