

March 27, 2008

Louise Pagé-Valin
Associate Vice-President
Human Resources Services
University of Ottawa
Tabaret Hall
550 Cumberland Street
(INTRA and by email)

**Re: Letter of disagreement pursuant to 13.3.1;
Dean's letter of March 19, 2008;
matter of uOttawa.ca copyrighted images on UofOWatch blog.**

Dear Mrs. Pagé-Valin:

This is a letter of disagreement pursuant to 13.3.1, in the matter of the Dean of Science's 39.4.2.2(c) letter of March 19, 2008, regarding my use of copyrighted images on the UofOWatch blog.

The Dean's charges have no merit in the academic circumstances of this case.

In addition, the Dean's letter of March 19, 2008, to the Board does not include all relevant documentation as required by 39.4.2.2. I therefore ask that the Dean prepare a new letter and that all deadlines be adjusted accordingly by reinitiating the 39.4.2.2(c) process.

Missing documents that should be included with the Dean's new letter include:

(1) Copies of all the posts at UofOWatch.blogspot.com that contain copyrighted uOttawa.ca images. One cannot judge the issues in this case without seeing the primary evidence and without being clear on exactly which images are claimed to be in contravention of University regulations or guidelines.

(2) All the correspondence between the Dean and myself about the investigative methods that were used in connection with this case.

(3) All the documents relating to the Notice under the Libel and Slander Act served to me by VP-Resources Victor Simon, given the connection explained in my grievance G-16 which the dean has included in his letter to the Board of March 19, 2008.

(4) Copies of my past grievances (and attached/supporting documents) that are referred to in my grievance G-16 which the dean has included in his letter to the Board of March 19, 2008.

(5) A copy of the present Letter of Disagreement.

Also, I continue to ask that the Dean specify his investigation methods and sources in securing the private Ottawa Cinema Politica emails that he has used in this matter. An answer should be provided (39.1.2.1) before the Board can judge this case and before I am given a chance to respond. To say that the emails are sent to many people does not explain how each email ends up on the Dean's desk or how this mechanism for the Dean receiving the emails was established.

I ask to be present at the Board meeting(s) that will discuss this matter and to be given the opportunity to present my defence in person to the Board.

Please acknowledge the present letter. I await the dean's new 39.4.2.2(c) letter that follows 39.4.2.2 and the dean's answer to the above question so that I may respond following the Collective Agreement.

Sincerely,

Denis Rancourt
(Professor)

Cc: APUO.