

Part 30

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

Q. Dr. Saunders, did you give Dr. Depree any reason for sustaining all evaluations [DePree's appeals of annual evaluations for the years of 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2007]?

A. No.

Q. Did you have reasons?

A. Yes.

Q. What were those reasons?

A. I found no -- no reason to overturn the evaluations.

Q. And what would you require as a reason to overturn an evaluation?

A. On other cases, I would have to -- I really can't answer that. There are too many reasons when I might do that to really enumerate them.

Q. What would you look for in terms of determining whether to reverse an evaluation?

A. I would look for anything --

Q. Okay?

A. -- in the appeal or in the process that indicated that the department may have departed from its own policy.

Q. What are the policies of the college of business?

A. I can't say.

Q. That you applied in this case?

A. I can't remember.

Q. Is there anything that would remind you of what you considered?

A. I don't think so.

Q. Dr. Saunders, did you review the college of business faculty handbook?

A. No.

Q. Prior to making a decision?

A. No.

Q. And what would the college of business faculty handbook likely tell you?

A. That would include college standards.

Q. And did you look at those college standards?

A. No.

Q. Did you discuss with anyone the college standards?

A. No.

Q. Is it unusual to have four years of grievances backed up for a single faculty?

A. I don't know.

Q. Have you seen four years of evaluations that have not been --

A. No.

Q. -- processed during your tenure?

A. No...

Q. Dr. Saunders, by your failure to act on the 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006 grievances from June 2007 until December 8, 2008, did you allow Dr. Depree's grievances to languish?

A. I don't think so.

Q. And why do you believe you did not?

A. Well, for a couple of reasons. I inherited the appeals.

So, if a Saunders "inherits" appeals, she can take years to answer them. That makes about as much sense as the rest of her testimony. Dr. Saunders found no reason to overturn the lower level decisions (some of which had been decided in Professor

DePree's favor, but she did not know that because she had not read them) but she did not review the CoB Faculty handbook so that she would understand the standards she was to apply. Let's review this to make sure we understand Dr. Saunders. When she was asked, "What would you look for in terms of determining whether to reverse an evaluation?" she answered, "I would look for anything in the appeal or in the process that indicated that the department may have departed from its own policy." But when asked if she read the department's "own policy" to be able to understand the standard she'd apply, she answered, "No."

Saunders had five years of grievances for more than a year. It never occurred to her that the delays were *per se* an abuse of process. She was dealing with highly unusual events—even according to her own testimony—and she has no idea why she decided against the appeals. Unusual events are remembered events, if you're being honest. By the way, the annual evaluations were written by several administrators who petitioned the president to fire Professor DePree. Do you think it is possible (even likely) that their evaluations were motivated by bias? What does it take to raise a red flag for Saunders? (More about the perversion of the annual evaluation process in future reports.)

This is what you get, dear colleagues, when authority exists without accountability. You better hope you are not identified and isolated for Saunders' arbitrary and capricious judgments.

What is your hard earned tenure really worth?