



Subject: Dean's letter of February 5th, concerns about Dean's methods of investigation

From: dgr@uottawa.ca

Date: Sun, 17 Feb 2008 13:43:49 -0500 (EST)

To: deansci@uottawa.ca

CC: patry@uottawa.ca, apuoadm@uottawa.ca, vretudes@uottawa.ca, dgr@uottawa.ca, rmajor@uottawa.ca



February 17, 2008

André Lalonde
Dean of the Faculty of Science

UofOW copyright
OCP
investigation methods

Re: Dean's letter of February 5th, concerns about Dean's methods of investigation

Dear André Lalonde,

Thank you for your letter of February 5, 2008, in which you partially reply to one of several concerns I expressed in my letter of January 14, 2008. Specifically, your February 5th letter is a partial reply to (i.e., a deflection of) my requests that you clarify how you obtained a copy of my December 28, 2007, email to my OCP list and that you inform me of the methods that you were using to investigate me. (You sent me two letters on February 5, 2008: The other was a related letter of discipline.)

In my email of January 14, 2008, I made four specific requests:

- (1) That you inform me about how you received a copy of my December 28, 2007, email to my private OCP list.
- (2) That you inform me about the methods you were/are using in your investigation.
- (3) That an independent third person judge the matter of copyright of uOttawa.ca photos used on the UofOWatch blog because you are in conflict of interest in this regard, since one of the photos is of you.
- (4) That you inform me of the existence of any Senate-approved rule(s) specifying how professors can or cannot use uOttawa.ca images and

that you
provide me with the relevant records of such rule(s).

In your letter of February 5th, you chose to not answer any of the
above
questions, to deflect my above questions (1) and (2), and to simply
ignore
my above requests (3) and (4).

Your February 5th letter states:

"You can be assured that the University of Ottawa is not reviewing
or
accessing your email account." and "... I am surprised that you would
be
asserting any kind of privacy right over a document which you
distribute
so broadly."

In addition, your letter of February 5th confirms that the
University
(your office) obtained a copy of my December 28th email to OCP:
"you
inquire about the means by which the University obtained a copy."

My question (1) is not whether or not the University reviews or
accesses
my uOttawa.ca email account. My question is: How did you obtain a
copy of
my December 28th email to OCP? Why would you not simply answer this
question rather than changing the topic in stating one thing that
you are
not doing?

Regarding my question (2), presumably you have investigated me (as
process
requires before a letter of discipline is sent): Why not inform me
of
your methods and of the extent of your investigation? Why avoid
this
point in your letter?

Why did you take the care to explicitly deflect my above questions
(1) and
(2), while preferring to simply ignore my requests (3) and (4)? I
find
these inconsistencies and your lack of answers quite troubling,
given the
seriousness of the situation.

There are many investigative and surveillance methods other than
accessing
an employee's uOttawa.ca email account. Some of these are unethical

or
even illegal. All are unethical and against the spirit and text of
the
Collective Agreement if the employer does not inform the employee of
their
use and if these are not justified in the specific circumstances.
General
information collecting campaigns (so-called fishing expeditions),
for
example, are never justified in a university context.

Therefore, why not remove all doubt by simply answering my above
questions
(1) and (2)?

I therefore here repeat these questions, awaiting direct and timely
answers:

**How did you obtain a copy of the December 28th email?
**What investigative methods have you and are you using?

In addition, I hereby ask:

**Have you performed investigations of me in the past that were not
related to specific discipline items or that I was not informed of -
since
when, and by which methods?

**Am I currently under investigation or surveillance, using which
methods,
and for which reasons?

You will agree that even if my privately managed OCP email list
contained
a million addresses, this would not provide a magical mechanism
whereby
each email (or even one) finds itself on your desk. **How many OCP
emails
have you "obtained," and by which mechanisms?

Prompt answers (to **) will do much to relieve my concerns over the
troubling circumstances depicted in your February 5th letter.

Please acknowledge the present letter and reply by February 22nd.

At the very least, I may need to inform the members of my OCP email
list
of any institutional surveillance being applied to these
communications,
or at least warn them of this possibility if you decide to not reply
to my
reiterated concerns.

I have put President Gilles Patry and VP-Academic Robert Major in cc so that they may be personally informed of my concerns and so that they will investigate the methods you have/are using in your investigations of me.

Sincerely,
Denis Rancourt
Professor of Physics

cc: President, VP-Academic, APUO

Read: Dean's letter of February 5th, concerns about Dean'...

Subject: Read: Dean's letter of February 5th, concerns about Dean's methods of investigation

From: "Gilles Patry" <patry@uottawa.ca>

Date: Sun, 17 Feb 2008 14:37:28 -0500

To: <dgr@uottawa.ca>

Your message

To: Deansci

Cc: Gilles Patry; APUOADM; Vice-recteur Etudes;
dgr@uottawa.ca;

Robert Major

Subject: Dean's letter of February 5th, concerns about Dean's methods of investigation

Sent: Sun, 17 Feb 2008 13:43:49 -0500

was read on Sun, 17 Feb 2008 14:37:28 -0500

Final-Recipient: RFC822; patry@uottawa.ca

Disposition: automatic-action/MDN-sent-automatically; displayed

X-MSEch-Correlation-Key: ZQgQLNHhqUKwLrifi0fvq1w==

Original-Message-ID:

<11494.99.241.10.90.1203273829.squirrel@web16.uottawa.ca>