

January 3, 2007

Louise Pagé-Valin
Associate Vice-President
Human Resources Services
University of Ottawa
Tabaret Hall
550 Cumberland Street
INTRA
(and by e-mail without attached documents)

Dear Mrs. Pagé-Valin:

Notice of grievance: Employer must stop derogatory and threatening behaviour of Professor Alain St-Amant, Chairman of Chemistry; must investigate Professor St-Amant for harassment against me; and must stop its own ongoing harassment against me

During the fall 2006 academic term I taught SCI 1101, Science in Society, the first time this new course was given. Professor Alain St-Amant, Chairman of Chemistry, has made public statements and statements to all members of the Senate and statements to my superiors and statements to several students and to others, about my delivery of SCI 1101 that go beyond the bounds of critical opinion and cross into: intimidation, libel, defamation, and personal threats.

I have seen no evidence that the employer has attempted to mitigate this behaviour of Professor St-Amant. Indeed, the behaviour has not been ameliorated since it was first brought to the attention of the employer by myself, by several students, and by Professor St-Amant's various communications themselves.

In addition, the employer has continued its now longstanding pattern of harassment against me by echoing some of Professor St-Amant's unjustified positions: The Dean of Science has sent me unwarranted and unsubstantiated letters of accusation concerning SCI 1101 and has not rescinded these accusations despite my replies. If refer to the Dean's letters dated November 27, 2006 [1], and December 1, 2006 [2], and to my e-mail replies dated December 4, 2006 [3], and December 5, 2006 [4]. ([Number] refers to attached documents reference numbers.)

Attached are nine letters of support to date [5] to University executives from professional occupation community members who regularly attended the classes of SCI 1101, fall 2006. These independent and informed letters of support describe a situation that is in stark contrast to the gossip-based imaginings of both Professor St-Amant and the employer and in contrast to the employer's discrimination against SCI 1101, that has

included: (1) official instructions both from the Executive of the Senate and from the Dean of Science to rescind my invitation for open participation by community members to SCI 1101 and a related disciplinary investigation that is still in effect; (2) unjustified expulsion of students in mid-term (Sebastian and Douglas Foster); (3) obstinacy in not providing the needed teacher assistant (TA) support despite a clearly expressed need, thereby causing my workload for the fall 2006 term to be excessive and forcing me to resign from the DTTC; (4) an Executive of the Senate order to review the grading system in SCI 1101; (5) officially qualifying this Science-code (SCI-code) course as “not counting for a Science course”; (6) multiple attempts at sidetracking the course approval process; and (7) the above mentioned attacks from the present Dean regarding course content and grading. All of the last four (acting or regular) deans of the Faculty of Science have contributed to this discrimination: Professor’s Detellier, Dabrowski, Moon, and Lalonde.

The employer is responsible for providing a safe and healthy working environment and this includes protection against (possibly over stressed) employees who practice abusive or harmful behaviour or who show signs of likelihood to practice dangerous behaviour.

Members are bound by the Collective Agreement to observe commonly accepted norms of fairness and ethical behaviour: Professor St-Amant has not. It is therefore the at least partial responsibility of the employer to correct this situation and prevent it from continuing.

The employer is responsible to ensure that no members will be discriminated against regarding discipline. Compared to the unimpeded and documented behaviours of Professor St-Amant, I have been subjected to disciplinary processes regarding matters that were invalid and trivial (e.g., the JSA and CUPE issues). Even a disciplinary investigation for inviting community members into my classroom has not yet been rescinded.

The employer is bound to ensure that no member is discriminated against, yet the unusual scrutiny of, administrative restrictions on, and attacks on SCI 1101 – a course that I proposed the creation of and then taught and that is not related to any specific study program but is in one of my areas of academic research (science in society) – constitutes possibly unparalleled discrimination against a course associated with a particular professor at the University of Ottawa.

In addition, my new area of academic research of physics/science in society (with one NSERC-scholar graduate student who started in 2005) has received overt and behind-closed-doors extraordinary scrutiny by the Dean of Graduate Studies and other executives. Along the same lines, my attempt at creating a new SCI-code graduate level course in this area (an initiative supported by many graduate students in different fields and by members of the GSAED executive) has met with extraordinary resistance from the Dean of Graduate Studies, rather than with a desire to at least study and encourage the initiative. These items are part of the above-described harassment and constitute interferences with my academic freedom and with collegiality.

The employer is bound not to harass members, yet there is a long record of unreasonable attacks against me starting in September 2005 when the then Dean of Science, Professor Christian Detellier, over reacted to VP-Academic Mr. Robert Major's personal negative opinion of an unofficial web site used to promote PHY 1703, fall 2005, a course that shared many of the content and pedagogical characteristics of SCI 1101. Some of the early history of the ongoing employer's harassment was documented in a grievance I filed on November 28, 2005 [6]. Some of the more recent items are listed in my e-mail (open letter) to Mr. Patry and Mr. Major dated November 3, 2006 [7].

The questionable actions of Professor St-Amant go back to 2005 (in relation to PHY 1703, fall 2005, and other related issues) and include:

- Sending derogatory messages about me or my work to other colleagues, including colleagues of my department and including my Chairman.
- Publicly stating to a media journalist that SCI 1101 presented anti-Semitic material, and not retracting these statements after publication in the media [8].
- His e-mail dated December 6, 2006 [9], to me with the executive in cc.
- His e-mail dated December 5, 2006 [10], to all members of the Senate.
- Several unethical e-mails to students.

In particular, Professor St-Amant's e-mail dated December 6, 2006, to me is abusive, derogatory and threatening. It warranted a swift intervention by the employer who did not even respond to my related December 18, 2006, e-mail [11].

Also extreme are the repeated false accusations (published in the media and to students) that (1) SCI 1101 willingly and through my consent propagated anti-Semitic material and, (2) that anti-Semitic material was presented in class or in course documents, and (3) that an invited speaker in SCI 1101, Professor Michel Chossudovsky (a Jew himself who has lost family in the Nazi holocaust) is anti-Semitic, does not deserve respect, and propagated anti-Semitic material in SCI 1101. Such false accusations of anti-Semitism are very serious, defamatory, and libellous, made more serious by the seriousness of anti-Semitism itself.

The messages to the executive of the University alerting them to this behaviour of Professor St-Amant include:

- My e-mail dated December 18, 2006 [11], that did not receive an answer.

- My e-mail dated December December 6, 2006 (see [9]), to Professor St-Amant with cc to the executive.
- The e-mail dated November 7, 2006, of student Nick Loeb [12] to Mr. Patry and Mr. Major, which was not answered (and attached e-mails).
- The e-mail dated November 7, 2006, of student Philippe Marchand [13] to Mr. Patry with other executives in cc, that was not answered (and attached e-mails).
- My e-mail dated October 27, 2006 [14], to the executive, signalling an exchange between Professor St-Amant and student Alex Vyse, that was not answered.
- My e-mail to Dean of Science André Lalonde dated October 27, 2006 [15], alerting him to two further e-mails from Professor St-Amant and asking him to intervene, that was not answered.
- The e-mail dated October 31, 2006, of student Nick Loeb to the executive (see [12]), that was not answered.
- The e-mail dated October 25, 2006, of student Federico Carvajal [16] (now a student member of the Senate) to Professor St-Amant with executive in cc, which was not answered.
- The e-mail dated October 24, 2006, of student Tammy Kovich (see [16]) to Professor St-Amant and to the Dean of Science with other executives in cc, that was not answered by the Dean.

I ask that the employer intervene immediately by stopping the behaviour of Professor St-Amant against me. I ask that the employer investigate Professor St-Amant for harassment against me, in all his actions since September 2005. I expect sincere and unqualified apologies and retractions from Professor St-Amant, at the very least.

I ask that the Dean of Science, in the name of the employer and of all higher executives who were cognisant of this problem, apologize to me for not quickly treating the continued unfortunate, disrespectful, derogatory, and threatening outings of Professor St-Amant with the attention that they deserved.

I ask that the employer stop its harassment against me immediately and start recognizing my contributions rather than looking for ways to attack me and encouraging others to do so by not intervening as required by duty.

As partial compensation, for the damage I have suffered (emotional, physical, to my professional reputation, and in lost scientific career development) as a consequence of the employer's negligence and breach of duty in the St-Amant matter to date and as a consequence of the employer's harassment and discriminatory treatment towards me to

date, I ask for a monetary payment from the employer of \$250,000.00 and an additional amount of \$250,000.00 to be deposited in a research account for my use in academic research and that I be given a reduction of one undergraduate course in my teaching workload (compared to 2005-2006) for the next two years that I am not on sabbatical leave.

I also ask that the employer treat the students – who were perturbed by the events involving Professor St-Amant and who wrote letters of complaint – with the respect that they deserve by answering their concerns and informing them of the employer's remedial actions.

Sincerely,

Denis Rancourt
(Professor)
Department of Physics

cc: APUO, by INTRA, and by e-mail, entire electronic file.
cc: Dean of Science, President, VP-Academic, by e-mail (without attached documents)
cc: Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies, by e-mail (without attached documents)
cc: Chairman of Physics, by e-mail (without attached documents)
cc: Professor Michel Chossudovsky, by e-mail (without attached documents)
cc: Students named above, by e-mail (without attached documents)
cc: GSAED Executive, by e-mail (without attached documents)
cc: Community members who wrote letters of support, by e-mail (without attached documents)

(Cited communications and media article in attachment, below, as numbered in above text.)

Relevant links:

<http://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/psychosocial/violence.html>
<http://www.ccohs.ca/oshanswers/psychosocial/bullying.html>

Documents cited in the grievance:

[1]



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté des sciences
Cabinet du doyen

University of Ottawa
Faculty of Science
Office of the Dean

November 27, 2006

Professor Denis Rancourt
Department of Physics
INTRA

28 NOV. 2006

Dear Professor Rancourt,

I have taken notice of the evaluation mechanism that you are using for the course SCI 1101 that you have posted on the web site that you have been maintaining for this course (www.alternativevoices.ca). The web site in question clearly states what is required of students in this course: "Nothing is required except your presence and your feedback about your own personal choices and progress". In view of this, I must advise you that all professors are obliged by the Collective Agreement to evaluate students' performance objectively in a manner appropriate to the course, consistent with relevant academic standards approved by Senate (article 21.1.2 (c)).

I remind you that in a letter dated August 29, 2006, a request was made that you specify the methods by which the S/NS evaluation method will be applied in your course and that a response has yet to be received. In the absence of your confirmation of an evaluation method, and the presence of contrary information on the various Web pages for the course, I am left with no other conclusion that, as yet, there is no evaluation method.

I therefore ask you to correct this and provide me with a) the course syllabus and b) the evaluation method, as requested by the Senate of the University, by December 4th, 2006.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "A. Lalonde".

André E. Lalonde
Acting Dean
Faculty of Science

☎ 613 562-5985
📠 613 562-5193
140 Louis-Pasteur
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada
www.uOttawa.ca

[2]



uOttawa

Université d'Ottawa
Faculté des sciences
Cabinet du doyen
University of Ottawa
Faculty of Science
Office of the Dean

December 1st, 2006

Professor Denis Rancourt
Department of Physics
INTRA

~~31 NOV. 2006~~
~~10 DEC. 2006~~
01 DEC. 2006

Dear Professor Rancourt,

I have taken notice of the speakers that you have invited to date in the SCI 1101/1501 course that you are offering this term and the topics that have been discussed by these speakers in their seminars. I have also read the summary reports written by students in the class that have been posted on the web site that you have been maintaining for this course (www.alternativevoices.ca). While I observe a clear emphasis on the theme of activism and social issues in these seminars and discussions, I also note a near total absence of any discussion on the role of science in our society and on the issues raised by developments in science and technology.

I, along with many academic members of the University and Faculty are disappointed that, despite our concerted efforts to create this new course and to have it offered this fall, it does not respect the content and the approved description.

Sincerely,

André E. Lalonde
Acting Dean
Faculty of Science

☎ 613 562-5985
☎ 613 562-5193
140 Louis-Pasteur
Ottawa ON K1N 6N5 Canada
www.uOttawa.ca

[3]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Reply to the Dean's letter dated November 27, 2006; evaluation method
Date:Mon, 04 Dec 2006 15:50:32 -0500
From:Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>
Reply-To:dgr@uottawa.ca
Organization:University of Ottawa
To:Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>
CC:Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>, Physics Chair <phychair@science.uottawa.ca>, Renata Green <rbotti@uottawa.ca>, Mario Lamontagne <mlamon@uottawa.ca>, dgr@uottawa.ca

December 4, 2005

Re: Reply to the Dean's letter dated November 27, 2006; course syllabus and evaluation method.

Dear Professor Lalonde,

Thank you for your letter dated November 27, 2006 (attached).

For the record, may I remind you that I answered the Dean's letter dated August 29, 2006 (attached) in an e-mail I sent on September 5, 2006 (attached below). My September 5th e-mail, among other things, asked for clarifications about the Dean's August 29th requests. Your letter dated November 27, 2006, is the first response I have received and arrived one day before the last class of the term.

You have come to a strong conclusion about SCI 1101, fall 2006: That I have not and do not intend to follow the article (21.1.2(c)) of the Collective Agreement (CA) that describes grading. You state that you are "left with no other conclusion that, as yet, there is no evaluation method". It looks like you are attempting to discredit my teaching of SCI 1101.

Although I do not believe that the degree of micromanagement that you are applying is justified and although I am disappointed that you have not made any previous attempts to discuss these matters with me, I choose to interpret that you may (for an unknown reason) be expressing concern for the welfare of the students and I will try to alleviate your unease by my answer.

First, let me state that I have followed paragraph 21.1.2(c) of the CA.

I have also followed paragraph 21.1.3(c). You are confusing inferred course content with

the official format of the course requirements and evaluation methods. The latter official format is the one I have announced at the first class, not incomplete and unofficial web material. A professor is entitled to make provocative statements in order to stimulate discussion. Evaluation methods of both students and professionals are a discussion topic of the course.

At the start of the course the students were told that the requirements were as follows.

- (1) Presence and participation are required: for the speaker topics and the workgroups.
- (2) Each student must send me a written report describing how he or she wishes to report his or her progress through the term.
- (3) Each student must report his or her progress according to the approved method that he or she has submitted.
- (4) Each student must keep a diary or notebook recording the class activities and his or her associated research explorations.
- (5) Each student will write and submit at least one class report about one speaker or panel event/topic, including the associated discussion.
- (6) Each student is required to come and meet me in person to chat about his or her progress at least once in the term.
- (7) Each student must answer all my specific requests to the class that could come up during the term (e.g., report on an assigned reading).
- (8) Each student must complete the final take-home examination during the examination period, December 7-22.
- (9) In addition, it was recommended that the students take advantage of the Friday documentary films and post-film discussions that were intended to facilitate and catalyze the research for the invited speaker topics.

With the directed help of the TAs, I evaluate the sum total of these contributions for each student and evaluate if it merits a passing grade. I allow compensation whereby one or several items may be weak but others are stronger than average.

For the course syllabus, I told the students how the course would be organized and what the theme of the course was, asked for their suggestions for speakers and topics, and told them I would keep them informed as speakers were booked and readings assigned. The workgroup method was explained. The students and I together choose the workgroup themes that changed as the term evolved, as expected. Do you require a detailed syllabus? If so, why? How detailed?

Finally, regarding your specific request “b) the evaluation method, as requested by the Senate of the University”, please explain. Has the Senate asked for my evaluation method in SCI 1101, fall 2006? If so, please cite the Senate minutes for clarity.

Thank you for your interest in my teaching.

Sincerely,

Denis Rancourt

Cc: interested students and community members.
Cc: APUO, Chair of Physics, President, VP-Academic

Link: CA: <http://www.apuo.uottawa.ca/Info/Convention/0104-CONT.htm>

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Dean’s letter dated August 29, 2006, community participation in SCI 1101
Date:Tue, 05 Sep 2006 16:50:43 -0400
From:Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>
Reply-To:dgr@uottawa.ca
Organization:University of Ottawa
To:Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>, Andre Lalonde <aelzr7@uottawa.ca>, Thomas W Moon <tmoon@science.uottawa.ca>
CC:Physics Chair <phychair@science.uottawa.ca>, Ivan LHeureux <ilheureu@physics.uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>, Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>

September 5, 2006

Re: Dean’s letter dated August 29, 2006, community participation in SCI 1101

Dear Thomas (temporary acting Dean) and André (acting Dean),

Many item’s in the Dean’s letter of August 29th are of concern to me and require clarification from the administration and further explanation. I was informed that SCI 1101 was part of my workload only on August 29th (by e-mail) and you will understand that I am very busy with the start of term in answering your demands. SCI 1101 was entered into the schedule system only on September 1st and students are now registering. The late registration fee deadline has been extended to September 15th.

You will understand that the nature of this new course (with invited speakers and panels every week and complex discussion themes) is such that the late date at which the course was approved is making things very hectic for me these days. I have asked for extra TA help given

the special efforts that this new course's parallel workgroups demand and given all the extra organizational aspects, yet you have answered that only a strict minimum of TAs would be allocated based on the standard formula for regular lecture courses. Please reconsider your latter position and inform me and the Physics TA coordinator Professor Ivan L'Heureux accordingly as soon as possible.

Regarding your second paragraph, I find it regrettable that the Faculty Executive would insist on qualifying this course as "not count[ing] as a Science course". My understanding is that this will mean that SCI 1101 cannot be counted as a Science elective in academic programs that specify numbers of required Science electives. This means that purely-science-content electives will be given preferred status over the only Science course that deals with the science enterprise and profession seen from the inside, science in society, and the associated questions of responsibility and ethics. I find this to be a regressive and unfortunate position that is against our institution's stated Vision 2010 objectives. In the process of having the course approved, only the Faculty of Science has seen a need for this position. Hopefully this will be changed before 2010.

Regarding your third and fourth paragraphs, the use of S/NS as part of a chosen pedagogical method is a right of individual professors as protected by the Collective Agreement (21.1.2). As you know, a grievance is in process to clarify this for the employer. In my opinion, given this process, the employer is acting in bad faith to impose unnecessary ad hoc restrictions in this case. The Collective Agreement does not foresee an ad hoc mechanism to verify a professor's grading method in a particular course. The S/NS method is a Senate-approved grading method already used in other non-practicum courses at this university.

I am not aware of a Senate-approved regulation that requires professors to provide their course syllabus to the University (the Faculty) before September 15th of the fall term. Certainly this would not be intended to verify or control a professor's methods, as you clearly appear to be using it, since that would be against the academic freedom and responsibility clauses of the Collective Agreement. The responsibilities of professors regarding grading and communication of grading practices to the students are already spelled out in the Collective Agreement and in existing Senate-approved regulations that do not contradict the Collective Agreement. Please either provide the explicit regulation or confirm that you are giving me an executive instruction in the absence of such a regulation. If this is not intended to verify how I will grade students in SCI 1101, then please explain your motivation for this unusual executive insistence.

Regarding your paragraphs five to eight, I believe your concerns and those of vice-President Major are mostly the result of misunderstanding. I have never "announc[ed] free access to University credit courses" as you claim. As you must know, students and I have designed a course (SCI 1101) in which free and informal community access and participation are an integral part of both the content and methods and I have invited concerned and involved community members, via selective communication means, in order to bring that needed element into class.

My understanding of University regulations is that students registered for credit must attend 80% of classes, just as officially registered auditors must attend 80% of classes, otherwise there would be little meaning to these official accreditations that appear on transcripts. It is also my understanding that, as part of Western World academic tradition and practice (e.g., Michiel Horn, "Academic Freedom in Canada, a History", 1999, UofT Press, pp. 446), a university professor is entitled to invite free participants to enhance the course material and experience, provided the obvious fire and other such safety regulations are respected.

For example, I often invite community experts and panellists into my classrooms who generously give freely of their time and knowledge to the University. Sometimes they become regular attendees and continued participants. Other times, we discover occasional community participants to have tremendously relevant experience and they become invited speakers. The community members that I have invited, in the most open way possible to ensure success, are not expected to be mere auditors or observers (no one is, although registered auditors can choose to be) but rather participants and contributors. In my experience, although there can be good community participation this is difficult to achieve despite best efforts and few community members would satisfy the attendance requirements for official auditor status. It is also my experience that those who attend most classes and who can afford to pay the auditor fees (\$77.) are happy to do so. On the other hand, using the Executive's recent mercantile logic, given community participation's role in this case, the University should pay community participants and all invited speakers and panellists, for what they bring to the University and to the registered students.

The question of cost is not a trivial one. Several anti-poverty activists and experts that have contributed in my classes in the past would not be able to pay the auditor fees and many working community members with valuable relevant contributions would be impeded from attending. Imposing auditor fees on all would be a significant and unjustified interference in the course structure, philosophy, and content. The apparent positions of President Patry and of vice-President Major, in this well documented case and as expressed at the recent meeting of the Executive of the Senate that I attended, would be, in my opinion, regressive and contrary to the University's mission. This would not be a good position for the Dean to take.

[As an aside: I do not understand the recent Executive position even in the general case. We should welcome the day when there is so much demand for free attendance (without credit or official recognition) to university credit courses that the University must station guards and fire marshals at every class entrance. That would be a good problem to have and it would be a remarkable marketing method for our credit programs. In my experience, I cannot imagine that we are about to have this problem in any course and it would also be very easy to fix.]

As is widely known, I have used the same methods of community relevance and involvement (and made the same community outreach efforts) in PHY 1703 F2005 (with great success) that I plan to use in SCI 1101. This approach should be recognized, studied for broader application, and celebrated by the University rather than suppressed in this way. Such a positive University response would be consistent with Vision 2010.

The disconnect between the University's Vision 2010 document and the recent University Executive's stance on my pedagogical practice in SCI 1101 is stunning. I hope it will soon be resolved as the product of a misunderstanding. I await your clarifications: I am prepared to communicate the University's position as you demand by September 8th, as I understand it, and my opinion of opposition to it, but I do not believe that this would be useful or helpful. Please clarify: "must take ALL necessary steps to correct the misinformation, stating that ALL who wish to attend the course sessions must register and pay [...]" (my emphasis).

Regarding your second-last (ninth) paragraph, I reject these unjustified accusations. I have never strayed from the text or spirit of the Collective Agreement. I have never not followed a Senate-approved regulation. And I have never refused to follow a direct employer instruction, even when it was contrary to the Collective Agreement. Such unjustified accusations and insinuations in an official letter, made in disregard of the Collective Agreement, are both inappropriate and illegal.

I await your answers (TA request; course syllabus regulation and use; University position on inviting community participation for SCI 1101; instructions for September 8th action). As always, I am prepared to meet to discuss these points. [I asked to meet President Patry on these questions, after they were first raised at the Executive of the Senate meeting, but was refused.]

Sincerely,
Denis Rancourt
(Professor)

Attached: Dean's letter dated August 29, 2006.

Cc: Involved students, Physics Chair, Ivan L'Heureux, Robert Major, Gilles Patry.

[4]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Dean's letter dated December 1, 2006; SCI 1101 course content

Date:Tue, 05 Dec 2006 16:34:00 -0500

From:Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>

Reply-To:dgr@uottawa.ca

Organization:University of Ottawa

To:Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>

CC:Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>, Renata Green <rbotti@uottawa.ca>, Mario Lamontagne <mlamon@uottawa.ca>, Physics Chair <phychair@science.uottawa.ca>, dgr@uottawa.ca

December 5, 2006

Re: Dean's letter dated December 1, 2006; SCI 1101 course content

Dear Professor Lalonde,

I find your second recent letter (attached) dated December 1, 2006, unfortunate. It looks like you are constructing an excuse for not allowing this course to be on my workload for the coming academic year.

You are telling me, not asking me, what the content of SCI 1101, Science in Society, fall 2006, was. You are not even asking me to corroborate your impression by using an appropriate form such as "please correct me if I am wrong...". You are simply informing me of your conclusion based on unreliable sources: an unofficial and incomplete web site maintained by volunteer students and rumours from "many academic members".

Please name the academic members who have expressed these concerns and who are willing to talk about them so that I may discuss these issues with them.

Your crude and superficial evaluation of the content of SCI 1101 and the methods you have used to arrive at your judgement are good examples of why a course like SCI 1101 is needed in the Faculty of Science. One goal of SCI 1101 is to train future scientists to go beyond this kind of limited thinking. In this spirit, allow me to explain where you have gone wrong.

The 3-hour classes were roughly divided as: speaker or panel presentation, post-speaker discussion lead by me, and workgroups supervised by me.

There were approximately 12 or more workgroups at any given time. The more popular themes had several groups. Many of the workgroups had titles directly implying science-society interactions, such as: environmental sustainability, climate change, agriculture and GMOs,

bioethics, etc. These were the most popular groups. Students moved between groups with different themes during the term. Other groups had titles involving societal effects on the science enterprise and science culture or technological effects on society, such as: war and conflicts, democracy and justice, gender and discrimination, academic governance, apathy and motivation, language issues, power structures, human rights, lifestyle choices, creativity, etc. My interactions with the groups further brought out the science-society interaction aspects.

I trust you appreciate, for example, the importance of the relations between gender issues and the science professions. The same is true about every societal theme that we explored.

Regarding my choice of invited speakers, as you know I am a scientist, arguably the most inter-disciplinary scientist in the Faculty. The speakers were chosen as top communicators and top experts in their fields, in areas that scientists and university students in specific programs are rarely exposed to. This allowed me to represent the societal context in some of its complexity rather than representing society as filtered through the eyes of a middle class white male research scientist. I interacted with each speaker and explained the goals of the course. After each speaker presentation, there was an extensive discussion period in which students and community members (many of them science majors and scientists) asked questions and made comments. In the latter discussion period I moderated the flow and gave my perspective as a scientist. I ensured that the topic of the day was integrated into the overall goals of the course and that interpretive relations were made with the other topics and areas.

Does a dialogue, for example, between an investigative reporter and a scientist fall outside of the course description?

In addition to inviting speakers on vital topics that are under-represented in academia and in science circles in particular, I made a special effort to invite researchers that specifically address the questions of science-society interactions. Sometimes it was not possible to schedule these speakers at class times because of scheduling constraints but students were encouraged to attend and asked to do the associated readings. Notably, Professor David F. Noble, arguably the greatest historian of technology's impact on society, lectured on October 23rd to a filled Alumni Auditorium (co-sponsored in association with the PSSA). [I suggest to all science professors that they read just one of David Noble's books.] As another example, history student Kevin McLeod, gave a remarkably well researched talk entitled "The secret life of physicists" about political dissident physicists. The last in-class speaker was physicist Jeff Schmidt who's famous book *Disciplined Minds* is mostly about how professional scientists are trained and how they function in the workplace.

I could go on with the other speakers as well: Professor Chossudovsky features a science section on his globalresearch.ca site and researches the use of science in war and the role of scientists in influencing US defence policy. Richard Sanders is a researcher of weapons technology and a leading expert on the Canadian arms industry. I am an internationally recognized environmental scientist and physicist. Sydney White is an expert in propaganda studies and in economics, both areas using scientific methods, and studies how big capital influences

society, including the science enterprise. Ellen Gabriel is an indigenous survivor of technology's impacts on Canada's aboriginal people. Lesli Bigould, as a lawyer, has studied animal experimentation in science and agri-food technology. Etc. And I leave out the Friday film and post-film discussion series that I lead, which was offered as an occasion for further explorations of the class themes.

Given my extraordinary efforts in SCI 1101, that covered the course description and went well beyond, without the expected TA support or a budget for speakers, I am stunned at the pettiness of your action, presumably the result of an inspired Faculty Executive meeting (?). Have you forgotten your enthusiasm and encouragement after the first class of SCI 1101 where Malalai Joya (Afghan MP) spoke? Need I explain the many relations between science and the war in Afghanistan?

Regarding course content, my only regrets are that your office deprived the students of the full learning experience by not providing the needed TAs for the workgroups and that your office has consistently blocked the project rather than encourage it. Your recent letters are good examples of this.

Regarding course content, I urge you to retract your untenable position without delay and to consider that I may well be the best suited scientist in our faculty to give SCI 1101, Science in Society.

To block me from teaching SCI 1101 as it appears you are attempting to do, would be to block my career advancement in developing this pedagogical experiment and in pursuing my research area of science in society. SCI 1101 is not only a popular course; it is also a laboratory and a community interaction, in the true spirit of Vision 2010.

To block me from teaching SCI 1101 would also deprive many students of a unique course and thorough examination of the place of science in society.

Consider instead offering a different course where research scientists give their opinions about the impact and importance of their work, as several Faculty of Science members have publicly expressed their interest in such a course - but are not many science courses already exactly that?

Regarding your comment that "despite our concerted efforts to create this new course and to have it offered this fall [...]", your irony is extreme: What I observed were concerted efforts to block this course, starting with a bogus argument that such a course did not belong in the Faculty of Science and ending with the shameful Faculty of Science position that "This course does not count as a science credit". Recall how a previous dean claimed to want an entire Science in Society program of study, as a way to block this course.

Is it so painful to allow a course that acknowledges that science is not at the center of the universe? Science both influences and is influenced by a much broader web of connections.

Sincerely,

Denis Rancourt

Cc: interested students and community members

Cc: APUO, Chair of Physics, President, VP-Academic

LINKS:

Unofficial web-version of Vision 2010:

http://chopin.cc.uottawa.ca/vision2010/pdf/strategic_plan.pdf

David F. Noble, Wikipedia:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_F._Noble

[5]

Nine letters of support from community members who attended SCI 1101.

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Comments on the Activism Course

Date:Thu, 30 Nov 2006 10:39:40 -0500

From:Alroy Fonseca

To:<president@uottawa.ca>, <president@uottawa.ca>, >, <dean@science.uottawa.ca>

Dear Messrs. Patry, Major, and Lalonde,

I am writing to you with regard to SCI 1101, the Activism Course that has been offered at the university this past term. It is my understanding that this course has been quite controversial since it was first introduced in 2005, and that the process to have it approved was uncharacteristically difficult and lengthy. Additionally, I am aware that another effort has been launched by the course instructor, Prof. Denis Rancourt, to introduce a second year Activism Course, SCI 2101. Given this development, I would like to comment on my experience in SCI 1101 this term, which I think you will find useful as you continue to work on this matter.

I am currently not a registered student at the University of Ottawa (though will be enrolling in courses in Winter '07 as a special student) and happened to stumble onto the Activism Course by chance through word of mouth. I attended the first session in September, was thoroughly impressed by it, and since then have regularly attended class on Wednesday evenings. Every class this term has offered me - and, I can only assume by general reactions, other students - a very stimulating three hours of respectful discussion, where issues that are not usually dealt with in most 'science' or 'arts' courses are questioned provocatively. The course is, as you are undoubtedly aware, highly interdisciplinary, and thus offers in one package a range of options for students that few other courses in any university do.

I would also like to impress upon you the benefit I have derived from the Activism Course for my professional work. I am a permanent employee of the Department of National Defence, within the Army's Strategic Planning group, where I work on contingency plans for possible future theatres of operation. The Activism Course has provided me with the space and energy to thoughtfully assess the implications of my work in a manner that I do not recall being offered through my undergraduate and graduate education. I completed a B.A. in Political Science and Economics at the University of Waterloo and a M.A. in Political Studies at Queen's University and in the five years accounted by this formal

education, I have never encountered a course as refreshingly interesting and invigorating as the Activism Course.

You must be happy to know that such a pedagogically innovative course has emerged at your university. Judging by its success, it could be a model for many more courses in the coming years. It's all very exciting, and I really hope to be able to enroll in SCI 2101 next Fall.

Sincerely,

Alroy Fonseca
Policy Analyst / Analyste de la politique
Directorate of Land Strategic Planning / Direction de la Planification
Stratégique (Opérations terrestre) / 5-2-2
Department of National Defence / Ministère de la Défense nationale

Anna E. Sundin LL.B.

Barrister & Solicitor

91B Mill St. PO Box 359
Russell, Ontario, K4R 1E2
Tel: (613) 445-3183
Fax: (613) 445-3424

December 18, 2006

Office of the President
Tabaret Hall
550 Cumberland, Room 212
Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

Attention: Gilles G. Patry, President and Vice-Chancellor

Dear M. Patry:

Re: SCI 1101, Science in Society, Fall term 2006

During the fall term, I attended many of the classes in Professor Denis Rancourt's course as a member of community. It was well attended by students and members of the community. The discussions were lively and interesting and encouraged the participation of the individual in society.

I am writing to express my support for the course and to congratulate the University of Ottawa for approving the course and thereby providing a forum for this kind of interaction between students and members of the larger community.

I found it to be an uplifting experience to be part of this unique contribution by the University of Ottawa to education. I believe the course has contributed to the value of the university within the larger community, the students' experience of university education and the personal growth of each individual who attended.

Once again, the University of Ottawa is to be congratulated for approving this course.

Yours very truly,

Anna E. Sundin

cc. Denis Rancourt

----- Original Message -----

Subject:AC Petition.

Date:Tue, 14 Nov 2006 15:13:38 -0500

From:Atiya Hussain

To:deansci@uottawa.ca

CC:Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>

Hi

I am a parent of a first year Ottawa U student. I had the pleasure of attending one of the lectures that constitutes Science 1101 (Activism Course). I greatly benefited from this, and I am looking forward to the course being offered in the following years, so that others may also benefit from it.

More than ever before there is a need for courses such as SCI 1101. Science is at the fore front of both the environmental crises as well as its solutions. Science itself being without a conscience, it is the scientists who who have to act as its conscience. For this reason Sci 1101 is essential and I hope that the department will continue offering this, and hopefully other courses similar to this.

Best regards

Atiya Hussain

----- Original Message -----

Subject:FW: Wendy's support letter

Date:Fri, 1 Dec 2006 15:19:20 -0700

From:Claude Haridge

To:Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>

CC:<dgr@uottawa.ca>

Mr.Gilles Patry, President
Mr.Robert Major, V.P.Academic

Dear Sirs:

I would like to forward this letter initially sent only to Mr. Lalonde commending the University of Ottawa for offering the SCI 1101 "Activism Course" but also to my disappointment for the expulsion of the two Foster boys because of their young age. I am hoping that there may be an exemption due to the course material not requiring prerequisites and also to their active participation in the class.

Thank you both in advance for considering this letter. I would be interested in your comments.

Regards,

Claude Haridge, P.Eng.

Electro-Mechanical Engineer

Terrapoint Canada Inc
140-1 Antares Drive
Ottawa, ON K2E 8C4
www.terrapoint.com

This email and any files transmitted with it are privileged, confidential, subject to copyright and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. Views expressed are those of the user and not necessarily those of Terrapoint Canada or Terrapoint USA. Any unauthorized use, copying, review or disclosure is prohibited. Please notify the sender immediately if you have received this communication in error. Thank you for your assistance and co-operation.

From: Claude [mailto:charidge@istar.ca]
Sent: Sunday, November 27, 2005 11:17 PM
To: Claude Haridge
Subject: Wendy's support letter

Mr. Andre Lalonde, Dean of Science
University of Ottawa

Dear Mr. Lalonde,

I am presently taking the "Activism Course" SCI 1101 as a community observer and find it very thought provoking and interesting. From the full to almost full attendance, it certainly is a popular course and I am pleased to see so many students and community members take such an active interest in current affairs. There has been a rich selection of speakers exposing material not normally seen and there are always many questions and comments following the presentations. If university education should stimulate critical thought and expression, then I'd like to nominate this one. Professor Denis Rancourt has done a great job in motivating so many students and the University of Ottawa needs to support this course as much as possible. Hopefully this course will be extended to second, third and fourth years and I think the University of Ottawa has the opportunity to make itself a great name for such a leading venture.

I wish however to express my dissatisfaction and puzzlement over the expulsion of two students, Sebastian and Douglas Foster. Although they are young, they have contributed by attending every class since the beginning and also by asking several questions during the discussion period following a presentation or film. It was pleasing for many people to see them at this age interested in complex issues and I wonder where they will be in later years after being given this wonderful opportunity to learn as equals. I think that denying them this opportunity however must be extremely disappointing for them considering their participation level which exceeded that of many other attendees. Understandably, some university courses require prior knowledge, but there are no prerequisites nor age restrictions for this course. With respect to expulsion, this is normally reserved for cheating, plagiarism or other unethical behavior which the Foster boys are certainly not guilty of.

As a former student of the University of Ottawa, a professional engineer and renewed student, I commend the University for providing this course, however I also challenge the expulsion of the Foster boys on dubious grounds unbecoming university protocol. I ask therefore that the expulsion of Sebastian and Douglas Foster be rescinded and an apology provided for this hopefully administrative error.

I look forward to your comments.

Regards,

Claude Haridge

----- Original Message -----

Subject: SCI 1101
From: "Conchita Fonseca" <conchitafonseca@yahoo.com>
Date: Fri, 15 December, 2006 10:38 pm
To: patry@uottawa.ca
rmajor@uottawa.ca
dean@science.uottawa.ca

Cc: dgr@uottawa.ca

Dear Messrs. Patry, Major, and Lalonde,

My husband and I are both University of Ottawa alumni. We are writing to express our concern with the approach the university has taken in handling matters relating to SCI 1101, the Activism Course (AC). We have been following developments related to the course closely over the last few months and believe that the instructor, Prof. Denis Rancourt, has been subjected to undue, and thus unfair, scrutiny by the administration, and that the AC project - from the approval process to the provision of adequate teaching assistance - has suffered due to a lack of support from the administration.

The AC is a unique experiment in pedagogy that should be embraced enthusiastically by the university, as it promotes independent thought and encourages students to become active learners and socially responsible citizens. Given its promotion of grassroots initiatives and its organic links with the campus and surrounding community, it is a course that, if allowed to grow and develop, will undoubtedly significantly enrich campus life. Indeed, it has already done so. It is the kind of course we wish we could have participated in when we studied medicine and engineering at U of O. My husband had the opportunity to be taught first-year physics by Prof. Rancourt and knows firsthand what a great educator he is.

As we settle into our respective professional careers, we would like to support U of O in its ongoing efforts to grow and improve. And we very much hope that part of that improvement will involve supporting innovative professors like Denis Rancourt.

Thank you for your time,

Conchita Fonseca, M.D.
Faculty of Medicine, U of O, Class of '04

Jean-Pierre Thibault, M. Sc. (Eng.) candidate
Faculty of Engineering, U of O, Class of '99

----- Original Message -----

Date: Fri, 22 Dec 2006 11:40:38 -0500

From: David Mandelzys

To: <patry@uottawa.ca>, <dean@science.uottawa.ca>, <rmajor@uottawa.ca>

Good Afternoon Mr. Patry, Major and Lalonde,

I am writing you regarding the Science in Society course that was offered at the University of Ottawa during the Fall term. I was a student registered in the course and I attended every class. As a graduate of the University of Waterloo, I would firstly like to commend the University of Ottawa for offering such a unique and innovative course. I wish I had the opportunity to have taken such a class while completing my undergraduate degree. It seemed obvious how much the students enrolled in Prof. Rancourt's class gained from the experience. In my opinion the spirit of the discussions, lectures and workgroups truly embodied what the University should strive to be.

As a community member, I too gained a great deal from the experience. I was surprised at how many fellow civil servants, private sector employees, small business owners, retirees, and others regularly attended lectures. The range of people involved showed how effective Prof. Rancourt was at using the course to reach out beyond the University of Ottawa to the broader community. As a student at Waterloo I often felt isolated on campus from the city around the school. Connecting with the community is an excellent goal and beneficial for the institution, the students, and the Ottawonians with whom the University shares its surroundings.

With all that said, I am concerned at the obstacles being put in the way of re-offering this course next Fall, and of the students and Prof. Rancourts attempts to improve the course by hiring more TA's and formatting the lectures in the way that best suits the course objectives. I hope that the University of Ottawa recognizes the 'Activist' course as an opportunity to lead the way in a unique undertaking, and facilitates the process rather than serving as a roadblock. I hope in the future to even potentially see Science in Society 201 offered at your school, I will be happy to again enroll should it be scheduled.

Thank you for your time and Happy Holidays

David Mandelzys
Research Analyst
The Bank of Canada

=====
=====

Dear M. Rancourt . . .

I am forwarding this memo to inform you that I sent a copy of the following letter to M.Patry November 9, FYI.

From: douglas grant budden
Date: November 9, 2006 12:29:17 AM PST
To: patry@uottawa.ca
Subject: Fwd: SCI 1101 'Science in Society'

From: douglas grant Budden
Date: November 6, 2006 7:28:10 PM PST
To: dgr@uottawa.ca
Subject: SCI 1101 'Science in Society'

Dear Mr. Rancourt . . .

Please accept my congratulations towards the convening of your Activism course, which I had the privilege to attend with friends, this past week. I had heard that this popular offering, at the University of Ottawa, had been greeted by many as an exciting 'breath of fresh air' and wished to experience this for myself.

I can only say, as a concerned farmer and individual faced with the numerous and confusing agendas, which apparently constrain and obfuscate our economic and political choices within 21st century 'Canada', that to witness first hand, the dynamic quality of your guest speaker [Professor Sidney White] coupled with the spirit of open, honest and spontaneous debate, which included the dimension of public interest, all created satisfaction that hope for a better future, for the growing number of disenfranchised Canadians, may be justified.

I would also like to commend you for the skill with which you moderated and directed discussion, such that no 'special interest' was able to hijack or monopolize dialogue. The classroom itself became the curriculum . . . the medium WAS the message !

Let there be no *taboos* within dignified academic investigation.

Voilà ! la VRAIE Université !

Please be sure to thank those responsible for enabling this intellectual 'window' on the 'real' world and continue with this admirable work . . .

very sincerely,

Douglas Budden,
Kyirong Choling Farmstead,
TAMWORTH, Ontario, K0K-3G0.

----- Original Message -----

Subject:SCI 1101 Science in Society

Date:Wed, 15 Nov 2006 08:53:18 -0500

From:Gerry Ohlsen

To:<patry@uottawa.ca>

CC:<rmajor@uottawa.ca>, <dean@science.uottawa.ca>, <phychair@science.uottawa.ca>, <mitchell@uottawa.ca>, <dgr@uottawa.ca>, <vpacademic@sfuo.ca>

Mr. Giles Patry
President
University of Ottawa

Dear Mr Patry,

Since September of this year, my wife and I have attended the above course as community participants. I would like to congratulate you and your colleagues in the Faculty of Science for offering such a superb course, one that fully embodies the essence of the Academy as a community of scholars learning together. As a retired senior diplomat whose career has focussed on the promotion of human rights and democratic development internationality, I would say as well that the course fully reflects the best of Canadian values.

I understand that some in the University community have had difficulty in accepting this course and its pedagogical methods. Our experience, and that of every student and participant to whom I have spoken, is that those concerns are ill-founded. The course offers a rich, balanced learning environment and merits the full and enthusiastic support of the entire community. Indeed I would suggest that the interests of the University would be well-served by promoting and advertising the course as an example of the richness and imagination to be experienced at the University of Ottawa.

Two specific issues have arisen that I believe merit your personal attention and reconsideration. The first is the case of two very young men, Sebastien and Douglas Foster, who were admitted as full participants in the course but who subsequently saw their registration cancelled. All of the participants in this course have welcomed the presence and engagement of these young men in the course; their perspective enriches the experience for all of us. In the interests of both the course and these two exceptional people, I would urge you to ensure that their registration is reconfirmed immediately.

The second concern is the provision of Teaching Assistance to the course. While Professor Rancourt benefits from the support of two outstanding TA's, I believe that the learning experience of this workshop based course would be deepened and enriched by the provision of a number of TA's sufficient to provide leadership to each of the many on-going workshops established at the express request of the students. This is, in considerable degree, a student-lead course; it would serve the University well to be seen to support their initiative in this regard.

I cannot conclude without paying tribute to the extraordinary performance of Prof. Denis Rancourt in designing and teaching this course. His enthusiasm and outstanding hard work are infectious and his subtle pedagogic skills exemplary. Prof. Rancourt is able to engage and motivate students ranging from the aforementioned eleven year olds, through first year students from a variety disciplines, to jaded and cynical senior professionals like myself. What more could be asked of a teacher?

Your attention to these matters, and your enthusiastic support for a course that greatly enriches both your institution and our community, will be greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Gerald Ohlsen

GERALD OHLSEN ASSOCIATES

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Commentary on Science in Society (SCI 1101)

Date:Tue, 5 Dec 2006 14:38:00 -0500

From:Martin, Pat D.

To:<patry@uottawa.ca>, <rmajor@uottawa.ca>, <dean@science.uottawa.ca>

CC:<dgr@uottawa.ca>

Dear Messrs. Patry, Major and Lalonde,

Thank you in advance for reading this letter.

I am currently an intern on Parliament Hill in the office of Pat Martin, Member of Parliament for Winnipeg Centre, and I recently took part as a community member in the Science in Society course (SCI 1101), more commonly known as the "activism" course.

I have been following the controversy surrounding this course with interest. It seems to have been an uphill battle by Professor Denis Rancourt and the interested students against the university administration to have this course even allowed to run. And now there is talk of disallowing the course to run again next fall.

This is unfortunate news. The University should be a place that fosters discussion, dissent, exploration and innovation, and I believe this course not only offered students the opportunity to engage in all of these things, but it encouraged it (which is unfortunately lacking in the large majority of most university courses and professors).

I was wary when I began attending Professor Rancourt's class, as I was afraid it might be just a series of ranting, poorly-informed speakers. However, I found instead a wealth of intelligent, well thought-out, knowledgeable experts who presented their views clearly and encouraged discussion and questions. What's more, I found that the students were having their eyes opened and adapting an overall positive attitude towards making change in the world and truly living as global, ethically-responsible citizens.

I'd like to present two Values listed in the University of Ottawa's Vision 2010. I think it is important that if the university would like to reach what it has outlined in the Vision, it should carefully consider it's own words before dismissing Professor Rancourt's course:

A university that places its students at the core of its educational mission

We do our utmost to help our students expand their knowledge, enrich their culture, boost their

creativity, enhance their ability to question and analyze, and take full advantage of university life to become well-rounded, responsible citizens and leaders of our society.

and:

A university that values its community

We encourage freedom of expression in an atmosphere of open dialogue, enabling critical thought, supported by intellectual integrity and ethical judgment. Collegiality, transparency and accountability are the principles that guide our university governance.

The activism course clearly embodies both of these values. It has, without a doubt, helped students enrolled expand their knowledge (by presenting alternate views of the world in which we live), enrich their culture (by exposing us to conflicts and issues around the world), boost their creativity (by examining different strategies through which one can achieve a goal), enhance their ability to question and analyze (a central tenet of the course), and take full advantage of university life to become well-rounded, responsible citizens and leaders of our society (what better than an activism course to push students towards this?).

The second value I've listed should have the university administration embracing this course with open arms. If it is true that "collegiality, transparency and accountability are the principles that guide our university governance," then why has the administration been fighting a course the strongly promotes open dialogue, critical and individual thought, intellectual examination and highly ethical judgement?

If you, as university administrators, are interested in helping shape students into critical and independent thinkers, leaders in their local and global communities that push creative and innovative solutions to global problems, you will not only allow this course to continue, you will give it the resources it requires and work with Professor Rancourt rather than against him. However, if you would like to mould students into a single prototype that does not ask too many questions or "cause too much trouble," by all means, continue fighting against the course.

However, I, for one, would much rather see the University of Ottawa creating knowledgeable, passionate leaders, known for their dedication to being informed and ethical global citizens, the kind of people whom I work with every day.

Thank you once again for your time,

Sabrina Bowman
Office of Pat Martin, M.P. (Winnipeg Centre)
366 West Block, House of Commons

[6]

November 28, 2005

Louise Pagé-Valin
Associate Vice-President
Human Resources Services
University of Ottawa
Tabaret Hall
INTRA

Dear Mrs. Pagé-Valin:

Notice of grievance: Fairness and ethical behaviour

I hereby file a notice of grievance regarding several of Dean Detellier's recent administrative actions directed against me in this fall 2005 term that, in particular, constitute violations of commonly accepted norms of fairness and ethical behaviour (10.3.1). Taken as a whole, and culmination in the events that transpired in November as described below, I characterize these actions as harassment and deliberate interference with my performance of workload duties (10.3.2(e)). These actions by the Dean followed the filing of my grievance dated October 11, 2005 and are summarized and described individually as follows.

Dean's letter dated October 24, 2005, notification of disciplinary procedure

Here the Dean accuses me of having not followed my teaching responsibilities in PHY 1703 ("vous avez abusé de votre pouvoir d'être en charge d'un cours universitaire, en le détournant de ses intentions premières, en changeant titre et contenu"), despite changes having been communicated both to the students and to the program director (Environmental Studies) well before the start of term, despite the course content being consistent with the course description (21.1.2(b)), and despite the Dean not having properly investigated the alleged offence (39.1.2.1), or having provided any relevant complaint (39.1.2.1(a)) (although complaints were claimed separately), or having informed me (39.1.2.1(c)) of having undertaken any such required investigation that would fit this allegation of inappropriate course content; all this after having explicitly approved the course, its structure and its content, before the start of the third class in the term. An allegation of inappropriate course content or direction must be preceded by an investigation of the course content (39.1.2) and is illogical in a case like this one where

the Dean has, after some discussion, approved the course in writing at the start of term (memorandum of agreement dated September 28, 2005).

Dean's letter dated October 25, 2005, alleged student complaint

In this letter the Dean threatened disciplinary action (conditional on the nature of my response) related to a new and not previously disclosed or mentioned student complaint that the Dean did not provide, nor did the Dean provide the student complaint after I requested it in writing (e-mail dated November 4, 2005). I filed a separate grievance dated November 16, 2005, to redress the specific problem of not being shown the complaint used against me. The Dean then sent a letter dated November 22, 2005, retracting all related letters and stating that he cannot produce the student complaint. The latter response suggests that the alleged student complaint may have been fabricated. The separate on-going grievance on this point may shed light on this matter.

Dean's letter dated November 1, 2005, unsubstantiated claim of anti-Semitism

In this letter the Dean falsely accuses me of propagating anti-Semitic material in my class (PHY 1703) (“je vous demanderai de justifier comment du contenu offensant peut se trouver ainsi véhiculé dans un cours universitaire”), again under threat of disciplinary action, and without having performed even the most rudimentary investigation. Despite my detailed rebuttal (dated November 13, 2005) of the Dean's unsubstantiated claim, the Dean has not seen fit to quickly retract his error, leaving stand a rather grave and false written accusation that two of the university's professors have disseminated hateful material in a university course.

Dean's letter dated November 3, 2005, CUPE grievance

The union representing teacher assistants (CUPE local 2626) filed a grievance against a statement I made in my open letter to the Dean (dated September 26, 2005; concerning his September 21, 2005 cancellation of PHY 1703). The Dean used this CUPE grievance as yet another occasion to threaten me with disciplinary action, if, by implication, I did not comply with the reparation requested in the CUPE grievance, again without even a rudimentary independent investigation and without first informally asking me for my feedback.

Dean's letter of allegation dated November 25, 2005, alleged unethical behaviour in CUPE matter

Despite my detailed letter dated November 22, 2005, regarding the CUPE misunderstanding, and despite a majority of Physics graduate students implicated in the collective grievance denouncing its position, the Dean has filed this unsubstantiated letter of allegation claiming unethical behaviour, that is based solely on a true statement taken out of context of my open letter of September 26, 2005. I responded in an e-mail dated November 28, 2005.

Dean's intervention to increase my winter 2006 teaching workload duties

In the last week of October 2005, my chairman and I had a meeting to discuss that the Dean wished him to impose a new course in my teaching duties for the winter 2006 term. In rationalizing this request from the Dean, my chairman explained by stating that "the Dean is out to get you". I agree with this assessment. My summary of this meeting with my chairman and my reply are contained in an e-mail that I sent to my chairman (cc: APUO) on October 31, 2005.

Dean's intervention to block my classroom booking privileges

As part of my plans to improve the learning experience for students registered in my winter 2006 PHY 1702 course, I booked an extra regular classroom time. It is not unusual for professors to do this but it is unusual for a Dean to take note and to ask the professor's chairman to cancel the classroom booking. An ongoing exchange was initiated with my chairman. The fact that the Dean initiated this action and part of my (admittedly frustrated) exchange with my chairman is documented in my e-mail to my chairman (cc: APUO) dated November 1, 2005.

Dean's creation of an unneeded ad hoc committee to examine a new course proposal

In my attempt to resolve the administration's apparent discomfort with the methods and content that I use in PHY 1703 (not to be confused with 1702, as the two are very different and offered to different faculties) and so that a similar course can be given bilingually and every year and without faculty registration restrictions (as is the case for PHY 1703), and given the documented significant student demand for such a course, I officially proposed the creation of a new course to be first given in September 2006, with a general science (SCI) code and title "Science, Activism, and Society". The rationale for such a course and its methods had already been given in detail in my e-mail to the Dean dated September 26, 2005, and the new course description was quite explicit about content and methods. This new course project is consistent with many guiding statements of our university's Vision 2010 document and it is in line with one of my research areas (Science in Society, one graduate student presently). This new course would not be required in any academic program (at this time) and would not be a prerequisite for any other course (at this time). Any such new course is already subject to pre-approval by six separate committees, yet the Dean felt it necessary to create an ad hoc Faculty committee ('working group') that reports to his office to examine the validity of this course and any such courses falling under the general theme "Science and Society". I interpret this as undue interference to be judged in the light of the above items. Despite my interest and relevant interdisciplinary research area, I was denied a position in this working group, without explanation, following an official request.

Dean's arbitrary cancellation of a scheduled grievance Step-1 meeting

Our first grievance Step-1 meeting (grievance filed October 11, 2005) was originally scheduled for November 15, 2005 according to Collective Agreement guidelines and was

arbitrarily cancelled by the Dean's office without agreement from the griever, only days before the scheduled meeting. There was also a documented attempt to cancel the second scheduled date for this Step-1 meeting, now slated for December 6, 2005.

Dean's letter of allegation dated November 22, 2005, alleged anti-Semitic discrimination

This claim, like the Dean's letter of allegation dated November 25, 2005, is so far from any reasonable interpretation of the facts (e.g., outlined in my e-mail dated November 13th) that it would be difficult for anyone not to interpret it as misguided. I submit that it is part of a campaign of harassment.

These interventions and their nature, based on tenuous claims and positions and unsubstantiated in every attempt to obtain the relevant documents, taken together can be interpreted as stepping far outside of the norms of fairness and ethical behaviour, especially given that each incident individually would probably not under normal circumstances have generated the observed official response.

In addition, the Dean's actions have significantly interfered with the performance of my workload duties (10.3.2(e)), as I have had to effectively stop all my research activities (and work beyond normal working hours) in order to comply and respond and so as to meet my teaching responsibilities. My research group (graduate student and PDF supervisions) has also suffered as a result.

I ask that the Dean refrain from any more such interventions immediately, that he apologize in writing for having used his executive power to step beyond the norms of fairness and ethical behaviour, and that he redress each of the above specific incidents and anomalies immediately. In order to partly repair my lost research productivity, I ask that the employer pay the salary of a post-doctoral assistant for my research group for a period of 6 months, at a competitive salary sufficient to attract a top candidate for a half-year contract (\$55,000./y divided by 2).

Sincerely,

Denis Rancourt
(Professor)
Department of Physics

Most relevant documents:

Dean's e-mail dated September 21, 2005, decision to cancel course
DGR's e-mail dated September 26, 2005, response to course cancellation
Dean's e-mail dated September 27, 2005, decision to break up class

Memorandum of agreement dated September 28, 2005
Dean's letter dated October 24, 2005, disciplinary notice, course content
Dean's letter dated October 25, 2005, new alleged student complaint
DGR's e-mail dated November 4, 2005, response to alleged student complaint
Grievance dated November 16, 2005, alleged student complaint
Dean's letter dated November 22, 2005, will not provide alleged student complaint
Dean's letter dated November 1, 2005, allegation of anti-Semitism
DGR's e-mail dated November 13, 2005, refutation of anti-Semitism charge
Dean's letter dated November 3, 2005, disciplinary threat, CUPE grievance
DGR's e-mail dated November 22, 2005, response to CUPE matter
Dean's letter of allegation dated November 25, 2005, alleged unethical behaviour CUPE
DGR's e-mail dated November 28, 2005, response to letter of allegation, CUPE
DGR's e-mail to Physics Chairman dated October 31, 2005, teaching load
DGR's e-mail to Physics Chairman dated November 1, 2005, classroom reservations
Dean's letter of allegation dated November 22, 2005, anti-Semitic discrimination

cc: APUO, Vice-President Robert Major, President Gilles Patry, Chairman of Physics

[7]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:open letter to Robert Major and Gilles Patry
Date:Fri, 03 Nov 2006 14:41:42 -0500
From:Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>
Reply-To:dgr@uottawa.ca
Organization:University of Ottawa
To:Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>
CC:Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>, Physics Chair
<phychair@science.uottawa.ca>, APUO <apuo@uottawa.ca>, Renata
Green <rbotti@uottawa.ca>, Robert Leclerc <rleclerc@uottawa.ca>,
"Physics Professors (APUO)" <phyprofs@science.uottawa.ca>, Physics
Grads <phygrads@science.uottawa.ca>, Pamela Harrod
<pharrod@uOttawa.ca>, David Mitchell <mitchell@uOttawa.ca>

November 3, 2006

OPEN LETTER TO: President Gilles Patry and VP-Academic Robert Major

Dear Mr. Patry, Dear Mr. Major,

I am concerned about how your administration and your offices have and are responding to the project affectionately known by the students as "Activism Course". I am referring to SCI 1101, Science in Society, that was approved at the last minute for this fall term.

As you know, many students fought to have this course approved, against what might objectively be called a reactionary executive and a discipline-myopic faculty. During this process, the students made it clear that they wanted a rich course with keynote speakers, parallel workgroups, individualized evaluations, curriculum input, non-alphanumeric grading, etc.

I am doing my best to provide such a continuously evolving course, in continued discussion and negotiations with the students. We are experimenting with a pedagogical method based on intrinsic motivation rather than limited to marks coercion to accomplish imposed tasks within specified deadlines.

As in all such methods, that are amply described in the pedagogical literature, more resources are often needed than in a traditional textbook-based approach. This was acknowledged and discussed in the committee process that approved SCI 1101. I made requests for more teaching assistants (TAs) than the minimum for textbook-based physics courses before the course started, directly to the dean and to my chairman. These requests were not granted (and barely acknowledged). Recently, I made an urgent appeal for a minimum of two more TAs (for a total of four TAs, in a class of almost 130) and this latter urgent request was officially supported by my chairman Mr. Richard Hodgson.

In meeting with Mr. Andre Lalonde, the dean's answer was a flat no. Indeed, the dean even tried to use my request to leverage influence in how the course is run, thereby simultaneously negating a real need and interfering with academic freedom. This is an about face compared to Mr. Lalonde's earlier congratulations to me concerning the first class of SCI 1101 with speaker Malalai Joya (Afghan MP).

I believe the dean had made the decision to not attribute extra TAs before we met on October 30th and that he had been instructed in this direction by VP-Academic Major and your offices. This decision is one that robs the students of a higher quality experience and one that is unfair to me in my position. I had expected adequate TA support and I have been forced to compensate with overwork. I am happy to do this for the students but unhappy about your apparent contributions to this problem and the lack of university support.

I ask that you intervene to approve the TA positions.

It appears clear to me that Mr. Major and your offices are directing our recent Faculty of Science deans (Dabrowski, Moon, Lalonde) to resist the SCI 1101 project and to confine my pedagogical and professional choices in this project. This is very unfortunate because the project is one that is celebrated by many students and community members. It is also a project that has attracted much outside interest from other educators and social commentators. For example, see the many web articles and the recent issue of Canadian Dimension magazine. (Indeed, the absence of an article in the University of Ottawa's Gazette appears circumspect, given the media attention to date for SCI 1101.)

Instead of encouraging this unique effort and asking how your offices might help in this difficult and daring project, you appear intent on constraining, controlling, and limiting its success.

There are many examples of your likely executive interference:

- (1) The TA situation described above.
- (2) The recent abrupt expulsion of two students from the class, based entirely on age discrimination.
- (3) The initiation of a disciplinary investigation because I invited free and open community member participation in the SCI 1101 class.
- (4) The ad hoc Executive of the Senate decision to "evaluate the performance" of the S/NS grading system in this course only.
- (5) The heavy handed re-writing of the course description at the final Executive of the Senate meeting, circumventing the entire previous democratic process that had involved student representatives.
- (6) The 11-month and 16 meetings process to simply approve this free elective course having no prerequisites, and the lack of transparency and the resistance to student input in this process.
- (7) The recent limit of 50 e-mail recipients imposed on my uOttawa.ca

e-mail service and lack of intervention to provide a practical solution despite my repeated requests.

(8) The refusal to retract, drop, and correct the many bogus disciplinary charges made against me to date, intended to punish me for my unconventional pedagogical choices and political positions.

And I leave out a continuous background of other items.

We need extra TA support now. We need a supportive university executive that actively advances the principles of the institution's Vision 2010 statement. Please oblige.

Sincerely,


Mr. Denis Rancourt

(Professor of SCI 1101, fall 2006)

[8]

http://www.charlatan.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=17747&Itemid=27

The Charlatan, Carleton University Newspaper.

Science course ignites faculty
debate 

Written by Marc Roy

Thursday, 05 October 2006

An unconventional new science course has ignited a heated debate between faculty members at the University of Ottawa this fall.

A course called Science in Society, but more commonly referred to as activism class, faces controversy surrounding its pedagogical method after being approved by the science faculty council earlier this semester.

Complaints about the course began in 2005 when it was in the form of a physics credit, officially titled PHY 1703: Physique et Environnement. The complaints led to a review of the course by a faculty council. A new course was approved instead.

The approval came "primarily because it serves the needs of a lot of the students on campus," said Richard Hodgson, chair of the physics department, who sat on the council.

The official course description calls for the critical analysis of "complex socio-economic, environmental, political and ethical issues raised by advances in science and technology."

Alain St-Amant, head of the chemistry department, was involved in approving the new course.

"The professor in charge just totally ignored [the course description]; he just gave the course he wanted. [...] There's not supposed to be activism in there," said St-Amant.

"I have enough freedom given the course description to do exactly what I had intended to do in any case," said Denis Rancourt, the professor of the course. "There isn't anything like it on the campus."

The course is being taught as "a course where you bring in a person to basically bash George Bush [and] the Jews in Isra'el; it's not what the course was meant to be," said St-Amant. According to St-Amant, the course has included "anti-Semitic crap."

Rancourt said that there is no basis to the suggestion of anti-Semitism in his course.

"That's going beyond the bounds of what is reasonable [to say]," Rancourt said. "That's

way out of line."

Some complaints about the course centre on its placement in the faculty of science.

"It's definitely not science [now]," said St-Amant. "As long as there's science and we put in the science, this can be a good course."

"Because it's focused on more social issues than the science, the science is sort of a secondary part of the course itself," said Hodgson.

Rancourt said the faculty of science is appropriate for the course because it is important for scientists to consider social issues. The course, though offered in the faculty of science, does not count as a science course towards graduation, but instead as an arts elective.

Despite complaints, Science in Society is open for the public.

"The whole idea is that the students have connection with the community [...] and that they benefit from all the knowledge and experience that is out there," said Rancourt.

The course is not graded traditionally, but instead simply as a pass or a fail.

"The whole idea is to remove institutional evaluation," said Rancourt. "You can't force students to learn, really. What you want is to encourage intrinsic motivation and free exploration into the things that interest [students]."

The website for the course reports that "the final exam is impossible to fail because it is based on your own learning."

"It's become a joke," said St-Amant. "Basically you show up, fall asleep, three hours are up, you pass the course."

"[Students] have to be there and be active," maintains Rancourt.

St-Amant said the course is "embarrassing."

"There's no place for that here," he said. "It can't last much longer."

According to Rancourt, there is no doubt the university will continue to offer the course.

[9]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:RE: clarification request

Date:Wed, 6 Dec 2006 23:29:19 -0500

From:Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>

To:<dgr@uottawa.ca>

CC:Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>, Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>

Denis,

Quit wasting my time and the time of everyone else on this list. I am not implying anything. I am outright saying that the course you delivered had absolutely nothing to do with Science and Society. The course that was created had incredible potential and you pissed it all away with your idiotic behaviour this past semester.

Do you care to debate this one? Do you want to go to the media and start a discussion on what was presented this past semester? Go ahead, and you come out looking like a complete fool. End of discussion.

None of this is news. How much clearer could I have been in my previous e-mails? The fact that you have to ask yet again just confirms that you're totally clueless.

Now please, leave me the hell alone with your asinine questions and comments. Quit sending me e-mail. Quit posting my e-mails on your course website (use your TA's for more constructive purposes than that...from what I read in the papers, you could have used them for other purposes).

I spent 6 hours today doing tutorials for two different classes with a total class size of 440 students. I give real courses and I put in a real effort because I give a damn about this University and its students. I have no time for your crap and I sincerely hope you take your little circus somewhere else. And soon.

Understood? Could I be any clearer?

Take care, and you better think twice before you spout your crap at me another time. End of discussion.

Professor Alain St-Amant
Chair, Department of Chemistry
University of Ottawa
(613) 562-5769

-----Original Message-----

From: Denis Rancourt [mailto:dgr@physics.uottawa.ca]

Sent: December 6, 2006 12:06 PM
To: Alain St-Amant
Cc: Dean of Science; Gilles Patry; Robert Major
Subject: clarification request

Dear Professor St-Amant,

I have been made aware of the fact that you recently addressed all members of the Senate of the University of Ottawa by e-mail stating: "All of the developments since the original exchange simply confirm my assessment that SCI 1101 was a complete joke (and a bad one at that...)." ."

Since SCI 1101 has only been offered once and since I was the professor of this course in fall 2006, could you please explain exactly what you mean by these statements?

In particular, were you implying anything about my judgement or ability as a professor?

Sincerely,

Denis Rancourt

[10]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Alain St-Amant** <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>

Date: Dec 4, 2006 10:06 AM

Subject: RE: Plainte déposée à la Faculté de sciences le 18 octobre et au Cabinet du recteur le 7 novembre

To: Philippe Marchand <marchand.philippe@gmail.com>, vacademic@uottawa.ca, ebany077@uottawa.ca, Vice-President Research <vrrech@uottawa.ca>, rbell@ottawahospital.on.ca, lbelhard@uottawa.ca, DEDUC <deduc@uottawa.ca>, Serge Blais <sblais@uottawa.ca>, Christian Blanchette <blanchette@uottawa.ca>, nbonneau@ustpaul.ca, jacques.bradwejn@uottawa.ca, Pamela Ann Harrod <pharrod@uottawa.ca>, UOINTL <uointl@uottawa.ca>, chapleau@science.uottawa.ca, Cecile Coderre <ccoderre@uottawa.ca>, adeckeyser@ustpaul.ca, Claire-Jehanne Dubouloz Wilner <dubouloz@uottawa.ca>, Bruce Feldthusen <Bruce.Feldthusen@uottawa.ca>, gfortin@ustpaul.ca, gazzola@uottawa.ca, georganas@discover.uottawa.ca, Nathalie Des Rosiers <Nathalie.Desrosiers@uottawa.ca>, jgibaut@ustpaul.ca, giordano@uottawa.ca, keepgoingtoschool@hotmail.com, Gilles Grenier <gxgcb@uottawa.ca>, Rachel Grondin <Rachel.Grondin@uottawa.ca>, Pierrette Guimond <pguimond@uottawa.ca>, dean.socsc@uottawa.ca, rjacques@ustpaul.ca, Bela Joos <bjoos@uottawa.ca>, kelly@management.uottawa.ca, ValerieSK@bss.on.ca, wkowal@ustpaul.ca, dean@genie.uottawa.ca, Deanarts <deanarts@uottawa.ca>, Andre Lapierre <lapierre@uottawa.ca>, Sylvie Lauzon <slauzon@uottawa.ca>, DEANSCI <deansci@uottawa.ca>, leck@management.uottawa.ca, Catherine Lee <cmlee@uottawa.ca>, Genevieve Mareschal <gmaresch@uottawa.ca>, havard-lewis@sympatico.ca, makaryk@uottawa.ca, vmezl@uottawa.ca, mouftah@site.uottawa.ca, David Mitchell <mitchell@uottawa.ca>, NPAYE091@uottawa.ca, carmen@uottawa.ca, Denis Prud'Homme <denisp@uottawa.ca>, drampton@uottawa.ca, "Francis D. Reardon" <freardon@uottawa.ca>, Adele.Reinhartz@uottawa.ca, rossmann@uottawa.ca, MSAEE005@uottawa.ca, Michel St-Germain <mgermain@uottawa.ca>, dschlitt@ustpaul.ca, marielle.simon@uottawa.ca, Victor Simon <vsimon@uottawa.ca>, DEANGRAD <deangrad@uottawa.ca>, david.smith@uottawa.ca, thibault@eng.uottawa.ca, btuana@uottawa.ca, tezel@eng.uottawa.ca, Cabinet du recteur - Office of the President <recteur@uottawa.ca>, Leslie Weir <lweir@uottawa.ca>

Hi All,

As I've repeatedly stated in the past, to every single one of Philippe's complaints: I stand by my statements in Carleton's student newspaper. All of the developments since the original exchange simply confirm my assessment that SCI 1101 was a complete joke (and a bad one at that....). I sincerely wish that I could say otherwise.

Take care,

Professor Alain St-Amant

Chair, Department of Chemistry

From: Philippe Marchand [mailto:marchand.philippe@gmail.com]

Sent: December 4, 2006 8:32 AM

To: vracademic@uottawa.ca; ebany077@uottawa.ca; Vice-President Research; rbell@ottawahospital.on.ca; lbelhard@uottawa.ca; DEDUC; Serge Blais; Christian Blanchette; nbonneau@ustpaul.ca; jacques.bradwejn@uottawa.ca; Pamela Ann Harrod; UOINTL; chapleau@science.uottawa.ca; Cecile Coderre; adeckeyser@ustpaul.ca; Claire-Jehanne Dubouloz Wilner; Bruce Feldthusen; gfortin@ustpaul.ca; gazzola@uottawa.ca; georganas@discover.uottawa.ca; Nathalie Des Rosiers; jgibaut@ustpaul.ca; giordano@uottawa.ca; keepgoingtoschool@hotmail.com; Gilles Grenier; Rachel Grondin; Pierrette Guimond; dean.socsc@uottawa.ca; rjacques@ustpaul.ca; Bela Joos; kelly@management.uottawa.ca; ValerieSK@bss.on.ca; wkowal@ustpaul.ca; dean@genie.uOttawa.ca; Deanarts; Andre Lapierre; Sylvie Lauzon; DEANSCI; leck@management.uottawa.ca; Catherine Lee; Genevieve Mareschal; havard-lewis@sympatico.ca; makaryk@uottawa.ca; vmezl@uottawa.ca; mouftah@site.uottawa.ca; David Mitchell; NPAYE091@uottawa.ca; carmen@uottawa.ca; Denis Prud'Homme; drampton@uottawa.ca; Francis D. Reardon; Adele.Reinhartz@uottawa.ca; rossmann@uottawa.ca; MSAEE005@uottawa.ca; Michel St-Germain; dschlitt@ustpaul.ca; marielle.simon@uottawa.ca; Victor Simon; DEANGRAD; david.smith@uottawa.ca; thibault@eng.uOttawa.ca; btuana@uottawa.ca; tezel@eng.uOttawa.ca; Cabinet du recteur - Office of the President; Leslie Weir

Subject: Plainte déposée à la Faculté de sciences le 18 octobre et au Cabinet du recteur le 7 novembre

Chers membres du Sénat,

Cette lettre est liée à une plainte que j'ai déposée à la Faculté des sciences le 18 octobre dernier et dont le but était de corriger certaines fausses déclarations faites dans un journal étudiant. Excepté plusieurs accusés de réception, aucune action n'a été posée par la Faculté. Considérant que ma plainte avait été ignorée et qu'il s'agissait d'une affaire publique qui méritait une déclaration officielle pour rectifier les faits, j'ai transmis la plainte au Cabinet du recteur le 7 novembre.

Les deux lettres précédentes sont jointes à celles-ci. Malgré que le cabinet du recteur soit au courant de l'affaire depuis le 25 octobre, l'administration centrale a elle aussi ignoré cette plainte, n'envoyant même pas d'accusé de réception.

Considérant les précédents que je mentionne dans ma lettre du 7 novembre et considérant la rapidité de l'action réparatrice demandée (écrire une courte lettre), je ne comprends pas les délais et je me sens forcé de transmettre cette plainte aux plus hauts comités de l'Université.

Merci de votre attention,

Philippe Marchand
étudiant à la maîtrise

(Lettre envoyée au recteur le 7 novembre)

Bonjour M. Patry,

J'ai envoyé le courriel et la plainte ci-jointe par rapport à certaines déclarations faites par le directeur du Département de chimie, Alain St-Amant, dans un journal étudiant (The Charlatan). M. St-Amant a reconnu lui-même qu'il ne pouvait pas fonder ces affirmations et qu'il s'agissait de rumeurs (de fausses rumeurs, selon toutes les personnes ayant assisté à la conférence en question).

Puisque dans les trois semaines qui ont suivi cette plainte formelle, la Faculté des sciences n'a pas voulu poser la moindre action pour corriger ces fausses accusations, je transmets ma plainte à votre cabinet.

Il y a deux ans, lorsque des accusations sans preuves ont été publiées par rapport à une des membres de l'exécutif du Sénat, vous avez répondu par une lettre officielle au journal étudiant La Rotonde dans les deux jours, sans faire d'enquête ou d'autres démarches préalables. J'espère qu'il ne s'agissait pas là d'un traitement préférentiel et que vous êtes prêts à défendre de même façon tout membre de la communauté universitaire victime de fausses accusations. Devant les faits encore plus évidents pour le cas que je vous présente, je ne vois pas de raison pour qu'il y ait un délai supplémentaire.

J'aimerais avoir une réponse par rapport à cette plainte **d'ici la fin de cette semaine**, sans quoi je devrai conclure que la Faculté des sciences et la haute administration de l'Université appuient les propos d'Alain St-Amant.

Comme j'ai déjà dit dans ma plainte, je demande simplement que **l'Université se dissocie publiquement et officiellement des propos de M. St-Amant exprimés dans l'article du Charlatan que j'ai déjà cités, et reconnaisse qu'il s'agit d'accusations sans fondement**. Je voudrais bien sûr recevoir une copie de cette lettre.

Merci de l'attention portée à cette lettre,

Philippe Marchand
d'étudiant 3499280

(Plainte envoyée le 18 octobre)

à: André Lalonde, doyen par intérim, Faculté des sciences

Bonjour,

Pour faire suite à mon message de mercredi dernier où je mentionnais l'article "Science course ignites faculty debate" paru dans l'édition du 5 octobre dernier du *Charlatan* de l'Université Carleton (http://www.charlatan.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=17747&Itemid=27), je vous fait parvenir ce message-ci pour officiellement porter plainte contre:

1) Les accusations non-fondées faites par le Pr. Alain St-Amant dans cet article, concernant le cours SCI1101.

2) Le manque de respect démontré par le Pr. St-Amant en réponse à un courriel que je lui ai envoyé demandant des explications au sujet du point (1). Le Pr. St-Amant a notamment attaqué deux autres professeurs de l'Université dans ce courriel. (La réponse en question est annexée à la fin de ce message.)

Justifications

1) Dans l'article du *Charlatan* mentionné ci-dessus, Alain St-Amant est cité en tant que directeur du Département de chimie. Un passage de l'article indique:

The course is being taught as "a course where you bring in a person to basically bash George Bush [and] the Jews in Isra'li; it's not what the course was meant to be," said St-Amant. According to St-Amant, the course has included "anti-Semitic crap."

Après avoir lu l'article, j'ai envoyé un courriel au Pr. St-Amant demandant des explications au sujet de cette accusation d'antisémitisme. Il m'a répondu:

J'ai dit au reporter que je m'ai fait dit par un etudiant que Chossudovsky a dit a la fin de son discours que « the Jewish nation has caused all of the world's wars... ». Si ceci a ete dit, c'est completamente inacceptable. Certainement on est d'accord sur ceci.

Mais soyons clair, j'ai dit au reporter que c'etait juste « hear-say ». Cependant, quand tu invites une personne comme Chossudovsky, il faut s'attendre qu'un reporter va assumer que le « hear-say » est en effet la verite.

Il nous est impossible de savoir si le reporter a bien cité ou non Alain St-Amant. (Cependant, il me semble peu probable qu'un reporter cite spécifiquement les mots " *anti-Semitic crap*" sans les avoir entendus.)

Quand à la citation attribuée à Michel Chossudovsky, je peux dire en tant qu'étudiant présent à cette conférence et qui en a pris des notes détaillées, que le Pr. Chossudovsky n'a jamais fait de tels propos. Je ne suis évidemment pas contre le fait qu'un professeur donne son opinion sur SCI1101, en autant qu'elle soit basée sur des faits. **En soi, le fait qu'un membre de l'exécutif de la Faculté (et cité comme tel) contribue à propager publiquement des fausses rumeurs au sujet d'une conférence à laquelle il n'a pas assisté me semble totalement inapproprié**. Je voudrais aussi rappeler que si l'on juge que l'antisémitisme est une offense importante, alors les fausses accusations d'antisémitisme devraient être également prises très au sérieux. Des milliers d'étudiantes et d'étudiants de l'Université Carleton, en lisant cet article, auront cru qu'un cours donné à l'Université d'Ottawa propageait un message antisémite.

2) La suite de la réponse du Pr. St-Amant à ma demande d'explications est encore plus offensante. Il écrit:

Mais soyons clair, j'ai dit au reporter que c'était juste « hear-say ». Cependant, quand tu invites une personne comme Chossudovsky, il faut s'attendre qu'un reporter va assumer que le « hear-say » est en effet la vérité. Si Chossudovsky était un scientifique respecté, clairement le reporter n'aurait pas écrit ceci.

Donc complètement pas ma faute du tout. Si tu cherches quelqu'un à blâmer, c'est entièrement 100% la faute de Denis Rancourt d'avoir invité une telle personne pour un cours scientifique. Un manque complet de jugement de sa part.

Alain St-Amant a donc non seulement rejeté toute responsabilité par rapport à cette erreur de jugement de sa part, mais il va blâmer à la fois le Pr. Chossudovsky et le Pr. Rancourt. Autrement dit, **le Pr. St-Amant croit que Michel Chossudovsky et Denis Rancourt méritent d'être accusés faussement de crimes haineux**. Je crois que personne ne mérite de telles fausses accusations. Dans un courriel subséquent, Alain St-Amant m'a dit:

Chossudovsky n'est pas un scientifique respecté. Il n'est pas un scientifique du tout. Si tu lis les articles sur le site web qu'il maintient, c'est évident que je ne peux pas respecter un tel individu. C'est juste une question d'éthique.

Encore une fois, le fait que le directeur d'un Département de l'Université insulte ainsi un de ses collègues dans une lettre à un étudiant, me semble totalement inappropriée.

Demande de réparations

Je voudrais que la Faculté agisse vis-à-vis cette plainte en corrigeant les dommages faites par les fausses accusations du Pr. St-Amant, par exemple, en envoyant une lettre au *Charlatan* et à la haute administration de l'Université pour dire que la Faculté reconnaît que les propos tenus par le Pr. St-Amant sont faux et qu'elle s'en dissocie complètement.

Je voudrais bien sûr être averti de toute mesure qui sera prise en réponse à cette plainte.

Merci,

Philippe Marchand
d'étudiant 3499280

cc: Leonard Kleine, doyen associé (études)
Richard Hodgson, directeur, Physique
Alain St-Amant, directeur, Chimie
Denis Rancourt, professeur, SCI1101
Michel Chossudovsky, professeur et invité au cours SCI1101
Tammy Kovich et Federico Carvajal, assistants à l'enseignement, SCI1101
Julien de Bellefeuille, v.-p. aux affaires universitaires, FÉUO

(Réponse d'Alain St-Amant à ma demande d'explications)

Salut,

J'ai dit au reporter que je m'ai fait dit par un étudiant que Chossudovsky a dit a la fin de son discours que « the Jewish nation has caused all of the world's wars... ». Si ceci a été dit, c'est complètement inacceptable. Certainement on est d'accord sur ceci.

Mais soyons clair, j'ai dit au reporter que c'était juste « hear-say ». Cependant, quand tu invites une personne comme Chossudovsky, il faut s'attendre qu'un reporter va assumer que le « hear-say » est en effet la vérité. Si Chossudovsky était un scientifique respecté, clairement le reporter n'aurait pas écrit ceci.

Donc complètement pas ma faute du tout. Si tu cherches quelqu'un à blâmer, c'est entièrement 100% la faute de Denis Rancourt d'avoir invité une telle personne pour un cours scientifique. Un manque complet de jugement de sa part.

J'ai hâte de voir un jour un vrai scientifique faire une présentation.....c'était le but du cours.

--

"The cure for boredom is curiosity. There is no cure for curiosity."

- Ellen Parr

[11]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Executive condoning and sanctioning of an abusive work environment
Date:Mon, 18 Dec 2006 15:38:54 -0500
From:Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>
Reply-To:dgr@uottawa.ca
Organization:University of Ottawa
To:Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>,
Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>

December 18, 2006

Re: Executive condoning and sanctioning of an abusive work environment
TO: Dean of Science, VP-Academic, President.

Dear Professors Lalonde, Major, and Patry:

You have received copies of the December 6th e-mail of Professor St-Amant (attached below).

I have retained the services of a solicitor in this matter who informs me that Professor St-Amant's e-mail is not only highly objectionable but also unlawful.

I would prefer that this matter be handled discretely and effectively by your offices rather than taking legal and public means.

Your silence in this affair and your apparent inaction combined with the many continued such unprovoked aggressive and unethical outbursts of Professor St-Amant towards myself, students, and others, appear to suggest both that you condone the behaviour and that you are not prepared to assure a minimal level of work environment civility and safety.

While I wholly endorse everyone's right to speak their mind, Professor St-Amant's e-mail is abusive, derogatory and threatening.

Specifically, my solicitor advises me that the following comments found in the email communication that you received are both unlawful and objectionable:

- that I demonstrated "idiotic behaviour this past semester";
- that I "...pissed [away]" the potential of the SCI 1101 course
- "Now, please leave me the hell alone..."
- "I have no time for your crap and I sincerely hope you take your little circus somewhere else. And soon."

- "Take care, and you better think twice before you spout your crap at me another time."

The e-mail is malicious and threatening. It does not critique ideas or positions but only makes disrespectful, libelous, and threatening statements. It is one of many similar communications from professor St-Amant.

By comparison, I have never sent Professor St-Amant any remotely similar message and I have rarely communicated with him at all.

In addition to noting that you appear to condone Professor St-Amant's established pattern of intimidation, I note in comparison that the employer has in the past attempted to discipline me regarding several bogus and tenuous claims.

I ask to be informed of the steps you will take to redress this situation. At the very minimum, I require that you attempt to secure: (1) a letter of apology from Professor St-Amant acknowledging the distress his comments have caused me, and (2) a full written retraction of all the elements in Professor St-Amant's e-mail. I also require a written assurance from your part that you will be vigilant in preventing future outbursts of this type from Professor St-Amant.

If I do not receive a satisfactory answer from you by December 22, 2006, I will take further action.

Sincerely,
DGR

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: clarification request
Date: Wed, 6 Dec 2006 23:29:19 -0500
From: Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>
To: <dgr@uottawa.ca>
CC: Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>, Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>

Denis,

Quit wasting my time and the time of everyone else on this list. I am not implying anything. I am outright saying that the course you delivered had absolutely nothing to do with Science and Society. The course that was created had incredible potential and you pissed it all away with your idiotic behaviour this past semester.

Do you care to debate this one? Do you want to go to the media and start a discussion on what was presented this past semester? Go ahead, and you come out looking like a complete fool. End of discussion.

None of this is news. How much clearer could I have been in my previous e-mails? The fact that you have to ask yet again just confirms that you're totally clueless.

Now please, leave me the hell alone with your asinine questions and comments. Quit sending me e-mail. Quit posting my e-mails on your course website (use your TA's for more constructive purposes than that...from what I read in the papers, you could have used them for other purposes).

I spent 6 hours today doing tutorials for two different classes with a total class size of 440 students. I give real courses and I put in a real effort because I give a damn about this University and its students. I have no time for your crap and I sincerely hope you take your little circus somewhere else. And soon.

Understood? Could I be any clearer?

Take care, and you better think twice before you spout your crap at me another time. End of discussion.

Professor Alain St-Amant
Chair, Department of Chemistry
University of Ottawa
(613) 562-5769

-----Original Message-----

From: Denis Rancourt [mailto:dgr@physics.uottawa.ca]
Sent: December 6, 2006 12:06 PM
To: Alain St-Amant
Cc: Dean of Science; Gilles Patry; Robert Major
Subject: clarification request

Dear Professor St-Amant,

I have been made aware of the fact that you recently addressed all members of the Senate of the University of Ottawa by e-mail stating: "All of the developments since the original exchange simply confirm my assessment that SCI 1101 was a complete joke (and a bad one at that...)." ."

Since SCI 1101 has only been offered once and since I was the professor of this course in fall 2006, could you please explain exactly what you mean by these statements?

In particular, were you implying anything about my judgement or ability as a professor?

Sincerely,

Denis Rancourt

[12]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Re: A Formal Complaint

Date:Tue, 7 Nov 2006 01:27:56 -0500

From:Nick Loeb <nick.loeb@gmail.com>

To:Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>

CC:Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>, Federico Carvajal <fedecarva@gmail.com>, Tammy Kovich <lovelyvegan@hotmail.com>, Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>, DEANSCI <deansci@uottawa.ca>, vp.academic@sfuo.ca

References:<35141BE6A60459488367EDBFED55F4FB65024C@MSMAIL2.uottawa.o.univ>
<145ba93c0610311438g7732a178q6eb9297bbffc35b1@mail.gmail.com>

Mr. Patry, Mr. Major,

I lodged a formal complaint against the Chair of the Chemistry department, Alain St-Amant, fully one week ago with the Dean of Sciences (that complaint and the following few e-mails are attached). The people who are in Cc of this e-mail were also the recipients of my initial complaint. Since I have not received a reply from the Dean I am demanding that one of you intervene so that I may reconcile this matter as quickly as possible.

I laid out very specific actions I wish to take place in my initial complaint to the Dean. These requests for action were reasonable in nature and do not necessitate such a long lapse of time. In addition to those actions, I now further demand an explanation from the Dean of Sciences of why he has not been able to acknowledge my complaint after one full week. Even if the Dean does not agree with my complaint, some acknowledgement should have been given that it was received and taken seriously.

As noted in the attached complaint, I feel that Prof St-Amant is limiting the scope of discourse on subjects I wish to pursue through tactics of intimidation and offensive language. Indeed, he is attacking my right to freedom of political expression. And as you are undoubtedly aware, this obliges you to respond to my complaint under Section 13 (3) of the *University of Ottawa Act, 1965* in order to ensure Section 4 (a) and especially 4 (b) are protected.

I am open to meeting with either of you, or the Dean of Sciences (provided he agrees to explain himself) to discuss these matters. I would like a response within two (2) business days as it cannot possibly take longer than that to procure an explanation from the Dean. I have been more than patient in regards to this complaint and as more time passes, I become more insecure that the University of Ottawa is indeed not interested in protecting its students.

Sincerely,
- nicholas loeb

On 10/31/06, **Nick Loeb** <nick.loeb@gmail.com> wrote:
All,

I am not going to discuss further the complaint I made earlier today. I do not believe that this is a useful endeavour, as I feel it merely serves to convolute the issue at hand. Prof. St Amant had ample opportunity to raise these issues in our initial e-mail interaction last week. His failure to do so speaks volumes of his intent to insult and intimidate myself as well as any other students that disagree with him.

I find that his circumvention of the issue at hand, in favour of a discussion on SCI 1101, is further proof that Prof. St Amant does not take into account how serious this matter is. This is not a discussion about the merit of SCI 1101. That is not what my complaint is about.

His accusation that I have misrepresented the content of my complaint is laughable. I did not remove the addressee information from his remarks. If it was removed then it was done so prior to my obtaining a copy of his remarks. If Prof. St Amant's defense of these remarks is that I was never intended to see them, then I ask those in the administration this question: Is it okay to make malicious remarks using intimidation techniques towards a general group of people? And furthermore, should one be surprised when somebody takes offense to those remarks having overheard them?

The answer is clear.

I stand by my complaint and anxiously await a response from the Dean.

- Nicholas Loeb

On 10/31/06, **Alain St-Amant** <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca> wrote:
To all,

A little background on this one that is essential to point out:

Mr. Loeb is asking for a personal apology for an e-mail that was written by me that was never addressed to him. The only reason he received a copy of my e-mail is because somebody chose to distribute it to him (or post it onto the SCI1101 website...fortunately not on the same page dealing with "Israel's genocidal policies in Paslestine(sic)").

Personally, I would have left the addressees on the final message so that this very important point would be evident so that an accurate portrayal of the events would be possible. But perhaps this is not really the goal of this exercise against me....

Each time that I responded to Mr. Loeb, I said that I stood by my statement that a lecture entitled "Jewish Fear and the Palestinian Right of Return" has no place in a course whose description is

This course critically examines the role of science and scientists in society and the responsibility of citizens having to deal with complex socio-economic, environmental, political and ethical issues raised by advances in science and technology. The grading system is S/NS. This course does not count as a science course.

This is so obviously inappropriate a lecture given the course description. I leave it up to everyone to decide what word is most appropriate for someone who believes that the above lecture indeed belongs in a course with the above course description. Actually, the same applies to every lecture that was given, or is planned to be given (save for one, perhaps), in this course.

I stand by my comments.

As for the little joke about the "F" word ("fool" in this e-mail thread...which was never directed at Mr. Loeb in any way as the original e-mail was never sent to him), anyone whose son or daughter has just learned the French word for "seal" will probably fully understand. My 7-year old was cussing up a storm that night. Perhaps the first part of the e-mail could have been suppressed, but the latter part clearly conveys my frank opinion on SCI1101 that I continue to stand by.

Take care,

Professor Alain St-Amant
Chair, Department of Chemistry
University of Ottawa

From: Nick Loeb [mailto:nick.loeb@gmail.com]
Sent: October 31, 2006 2:34 PM
To: Alain St-Amant
Subject: Fwd: A Formal Complaint

I have just filed this complaint with the Dean of Science minutes ago. In my search for e-mail addresses I forgot to Cc you.

- Nicholas Loeb

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nick Loeb** <nick.loeb@gmail.com>
Date: Oct 31, 2006 2:07 PM
Subject: A Formal Complaint
To: dean@science.uottawa.ca
Cc: fedecarva@gmail.com, Tammy Kovich <lovelyvegan@hotmail.com>, Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>, Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, vp.academic@sfuo.ca, rmajor@uottawa.ca

Dean Lalonde, Mr. Patry, and the many people in Cc,

I would like to lodge a formal complaint against the Chair of the Chemistry Department, Alain St Amant, for offensive and insulting language. However, there are much deeper issues involved that I would like addressed that come as a result of this language. Attached to this letter you will find an e-mail correspondence that took place between myself and Prof St Amant which I initiated, after having felt personally insulted by remarks he made. Those remarks are also attached to that e-mail interaction.

You'll notice in my initial e-mail I requested that Prof. St Amant give a written apology for his use of the term 'fool'. I asked for that apology because I believe that it is inappropriate for a Professor to insult a student's intelligence.

I also take exception to the use of intimidation techniques, based on my fundamental rights as a student of this University. I have the right to free political expression, as does Prof. St Amant. The difference between the activism that I engage in and the remarks that Prof. St Amant made is that his remarks seek to suppress those who oppose his opinion. Put simply, I feel insecure as a student that my right to free political expression is being protected by the administration. I cannot emphasize this point enough. You'll notice that the dates of the correspondence in question are from some days ago. I hesitated before lodging a formal complaint. I hesitated not because I did not feel justified in complaining, but because I was concerned that the administration would not protect me from further insulting remarks and political suppression after I made my concerns on this issue known. And it is exactly because of that hesitation that I feel I must lodge this complaint. Students cannot be made to feel insecure in their academic environment because of the activities of a Professor. This case is especially egregious because of the position Prof. St Amant holds at this university.

Because of the concerns that I have raised above, I wish for the administration to intervene on my behalf. The text of the final e-mail from Prof. St Amant speaks of the necessity of this intervention. The language is so condescending, and so dismissive, that it is impossible for me to seek resolution with Prof St. Amant himself.

I would like a formal apology from Prof St Amant for his insulting remarks, acknowledging that his use of language was inappropriate and offensive. I would further like him to acknowledge that his actions constitute an attack on my political freedom as a student of this university. From the administration of the university, I would like a guarantee that this kind of behaviour will not be tolerated from Professors and that measures will be taken to ensure the security of students in their academic endeavours. Lastly, I would like to be informed of any measures taken in these matters so that I may also feel secure.

Thank you for your time, and I am truly sorry that our first correspondence had to involve something so negative.

Nicholas Loeb

Gee whiz golly....I guess I should watch my "inappropriate language" in the future and resist from dropping the "F" bomb (fool...which phonetically in French is a non-cuss word meaning "crowd" by the way).

Seriously, read the course description and if still you disagree with my assessment, I can't do much more.

Take care,

Professor Alain St-Amant

Chair, Department of Chemistry

University of Ottawa

(613) 562-5769

-----Original Message-----

From: nick loeb
<mailto:nloeb@hotmail.com>]

Sent: October 24, 2006 11:09 PM

To: Alain St-Amant

Subject: RE: Your insulting remarks.

Hi,

You did not respond to the central issue of my previous e-mail. I would like an apology for the use of an insult towards me. Whether or not you stand behind your words about the course has little to do with the

flagrant

use of inappropriate language.

- Nicholas Loeb

>From: "Alain St-Amant" <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>>
>To: "nick loeb" <nloeb@hotmail.com>>
>Subject: RE: Your insulting remarks.>
>Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2006 21:58:16 -0400>>Hi,>>

That lecture had no place in SCI 1101 if you took the time to read the course description. I stand by my comments, and if you do not care

for>them, that is your choice.>>Professor Alain St-Amant>Chair,
Department of Chemistry>University of Ottawa>(613) 562-5769

>>-----Original Message----->>From: nick loeb
[mailto:nloeb@hotmail.com]>
Sent: October 24, 2006 7:59 PM>
To: Alain St-Amant>Subject:
Re: Your insulting remarks.>>

Prof. St-Amant,>>As a student who would have otherwise enjoyed a debate
on the merit of
>last>week's SCI 1101 class title, I am deeply offended by your remarks
(the>text>of which is copied below). The remarks in question claim that
anybody>who>would debate such a position (ie me) is a fool. I think it
is
>inappropriate>for a professor (especially one holding a Chair
position) to usetactics>of>intimidation and insult towards the clients
of the University ofOttawa.>>As such, I will eshew debate with you on
the matter and simply demand
>that>you send an apology for you callous remarks about the nature of
my>intelligence.>>- Nicholas Loeb>4th Year Student>>>Salut,>>>May I
simply point out that tonight's SCI 1101 seminar, according to
the>>course website, is "Jewish Fear and the Palestinian Right of
Return">(http://www.alternativevoices.ca/speakers/speakers-
2006.en.htm).Guess>>what guys, the title is needlessly offensive to a
significant number of
>people, and it has no place within the Faculty of Science,
and>definitely>not within SCI 1101 given its course description. I
will stand by this>statement. If someone would like to argue that such
a talk belongs
>within>the Faculty of Science or SCI 1101, I would be happy to debate
that>fool.>>>> Take care y'all,>>>> Professor Alain St-
Amant>> Chair, Department of Chemistry

[13]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Philippe Marchand** <marchand.philippe@gmail.com>

Date: Nov 7, 2006 4:14 PM

Subject: Re: Plainte - Article du Charlatan sur SCII101

To: Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>

Cc: Robet Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>, David Mitchell <mitchell@uottawa.ca>, Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>, Tammy Kovich <lovelyvegan@hotmail.com>, Federico Carvajal <fedecarva@gmail.com>, DEANSCI <deansci@uottawa.ca>

Bonjour M. Patry,

J'ai envoyé le courriel et la plainte ci-jointe par rapport à certaines déclarations faites par le directeur du Département de chimie, Alain St-Amant, dans un journal étudiant (The Charlatan). M. St-Amant a reconnu lui-même qu'il ne pouvait pas fonder ces affirmations et qu'il s'agissait de rumeurs (de fausses rumeurs, selon toutes les personnes ayant assisté à la conférence en question).

Puisque dans les trois semaines qui ont suivi cette plainte formelle, la Faculté des sciences n'a pas voulu poser la moindre action pour corriger ces fausses accusations, je transmets ma plainte à votre cabinet.

Il y a deux ans, lorsque des accusations sans preuves ont été publiées par rapport à une des membres de l'exécutif du Sénat, vous avez répondu par une lettre officielle au journal étudiant La Rotonde dans les deux jours, sans faire d'enquête ou d'autres démarches préalables. J'espère qu'il ne s'agissait pas là d'un traitement préférentiel et que vous êtes prêts à défendre de même façon tout membre de la communauté universitaire victime de fausses accusations. Devant les faits encore plus évidents pour le cas que je vous présente, je ne vois pas de raison pour qu'il y ait un délai supplémentaire.

J'aimerais avoir une réponse par rapport à cette plainte **d'ici la fin de cette semaine**, sans quoi je devrai conclure que la Faculté des sciences et la haute administration de l'Université appuient les propos d'Alain St-Amant.

Comme j'ai déjà dit dans ma plainte, je demande simplement que **l'Université se dissocie publiquement et officiellement des propos de M. St-Amant exprimés dans l'article du Charlatan que j'ai déjà cités, et reconnaisse qu'il s'agit d'accusations sans fondement**. Je voudrais bien sûr recevoir une copie de cette lettre.

Merci de l'attention portée à cette lettre,

Philippe Marchand
d'étudiant 3499280

On 10/24/06, **Philippe Marchand** <marchand.philippe@gmail.com> wrote:
(English follows)

Bonjour,

L'article du Charlatan contenant des fausses accusations est paru il y a presque trois semaines. Je vous ai signalé l'article durant la semaine suivant sa parution et j'ai déposé une plainte formelle (**en fichier joint à ce message**) la semaine suivante. Le professeur St-Amant a aussi démontré (voir message cité ci-dessous) qu'il entendait poursuivre ses affirmations insultantes sur un cours auquel il n'a jamais assisté.

Cela me semble sérieux et j'envoie donc une copie conforme de ce courriel au recteur, au vice-recteur aux études, au vice-recteur aux relations universitaires, aux rédacteurs des deux journaux étudiants du campus et à toutes les étudiantes et étudiants du cours SCII101, qui je crois sont aussi concernés par cette question.

Il y a deux ans, lorsque des accusations sans preuves ont été publiées dans un journal étudiant vis-à-vis la doyenne de la Faculté d'éducation, le recteur a pris moins de deux jours pour envoyer une lettre au journal étudiant concerné. Je suis inquiet que l'Université ne démontre pas le même sérieux lorsque c'est un de ces administrateurs (un directeur de département) qui reconnaît lui-même avoir propagé de fausses accusations. Dois-je comprendre de cette inaction que l'Université appuie les propos d'Alain St-Amant?

Je comprends que vous soyez très occupés et hors d'Ottawa pour une partie de la semaine, toutefois je considère que cette question est assez pressante et importante pour qu'au moins vous me référiez à quelqu'un qui pourrait s'en occuper durant votre absence.

merci,

Philippe Marchand

Hello,

The Charlatan article containing false accusations was published almost three weeks ago. I informed you of the article in the week after its publication and I produced a formal complaint (**attached to this message**) in the following week. Pr. St-Amant also showed (see message below) that he intends to pursue his insulting comments about a class he never attended.

This seems serious enough for me to send a copy of this e-mail to the president, the vice-president academic, the vice-president university relations, both student papers' editors and to all students of SCII101, that I believe are also concerned by this affair.

Two years ago, when unproved claims were published in a student paper concerning the Dean of Education, the president took less than two days to send a letter to the student paper in question. I am worried that the University doesn't demonstrate the same seriousness when it is one of its administrators (a department Chair) who himself recognizes to have propagated false accusations. Should I consider from this lack of prompt action that the University supports Alain St-Amant's claims?

I understand that you are very busy and out of the city for part of the week, however I believe this matter is important and urgent enough for you to at least refer me to someone who could act on it during your leave.

thank you,

Philippe Marchand

--

"The cure for boredom is curiosity. There is no cure for curiosity."

- Ellen Parr

[14]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Re: SCI 1101, Professor St-Aimant

Date:Fri, 27 Oct 2006 12:09:18 -0400

From:Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>

Reply-To:dgr@uottawa.ca

Organization:University of Ottawa

To:Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major study <vretudes@uottawa.ca>, David Mitchell <mitchell@uottawa.ca>, Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>

CC:Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>, Alex Vyse <stormvyse@rogers.com>, "Michel J. Chossudovsky" <chosso@uottawa.ca>, lovelyvegan@hotmail.com, fedecarva@gmail.com, Philippe Marchand <marchand.philippe@gmail.com>, Physics Chair <phychair@science.uottawa.ca>

References:<35141BE6A60459488367EDBFED55F4FB6501FE@MSMAIL2.uottawa.o.univ>

I hereby (see messages below) inform the Executive of the University of Ottawa of yet another response by Professor St-Aimant (below) to yet another valid student concern (below). It seems to me that Professor St-Aimant is repeatedly stepping beyond the bounds of acceptable professional behaviour. I believe that the Executive has a responsibility to attempt to correct this problem. I cannot help but compare the Executive's inaction in this obvious case with the several bogus disciplinary tracks that were recently pursued against me (and dropped without explanation).

I ask for some indication that Professor St-Aimant's continued and unfounded attacks on my teaching will be stopped.

DGR

Alain St-Amant wrote:

[Hi All,](#)

[The course description:](#)

This course critically examines the role of science and scientists in society and the responsibility of citizens having to deal with complex socio-economic, environmental, political and ethical issues raised by advances in science and technology. The grading system is S/NS. This course does not count as a science course.

[The talk in question: Jewish Fear and the Palestinian Right of Return](#)

I stand by my comments. I leave it up to people to make a decision on whether or not my comments are valid.

Take care,

Professor Alain St-Amant
Chair, Department of Chemistry

From: Alex Vyse [<mailto:stormvyse@rogers.com>]
Sent: October 26, 2006 1:34 AM
To: Alain St-Amant
Cc: Michel J. Chossudovsky; dqr@uottawa.ca; lovelyvegan@hotmail.com; redaction@larotonde.ca; fulweb10@magma.ca; fedecarva@gmail.com; Philippe Marchand
Subject: SCI 1101

Professor St-Amant,

I am a student in the SCI 1101 course and upon reading a communication attributed to you (see bottom), and an article in *The Charlatan* (http://www.charlatan.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=17747&Itemid=27), am dumbfounded by the callousness of your remarks. I'm curious to know if you have attended any of the lectures, let alone the one whose title offended you. If you had attended these lectures, you may better understand that the structure of SCI 1101 encourages the type of discussion you seem keen on bringing up, but within the context of a face-to-face forum. Indeed, the very guest who spoke the term "jewish fear" fielded questions from the audience on the language of his speech. If you had said, verbatim, what was in your (attached) e-mail in class, some passionate discussion of substance would surely have followed. But making these remarks in the context of newspaper articles, and e-mail seems back-handed.

You mention the course description in your argument, but basing your impression of the course on this is perhaps misguided. We discussed the course description on the opening of SCI 1101, and it became clear that such description could not represent the course, because SCI 1101 evolves presently by the actions of the participants (there are no lesson plans, or curricula). It was also expressed that the course description that appeared online was not the one intended by those working to establish the course. The structure of SCI 1101 allows equal opportunity for those who seem eager to denigrate it to bring their views to the course. Indeed, everyone's experience of SCI 1101 would be enhanced by increasing the richness of opinions within it.

You speak of talk belonging within the faculty of science, but in the same paragraph demean anyone, such as myself, who may disagree with you as being a "fool."

I find your language condescending, and question whether it reflects the attitude of the Faculty. You seem to value the integrity of the Faculty of Science, but your tone lowers the calibre of the dialogue within it. You discredit your position by increasing your rhetoric to hyperbole (using the term "fool" among adults in university) in a manner that

bypasses the forum within which your views could have made constructive discussion, i.e. the class.

If the title of any of the other lectures offend you, I invite you to the lecture (Wednesdays at 7:00 p.m., Marion AUD) to discuss your issues in person. Please do not interpret any of my statements as facetious or spiteful; I genuinely welcome all views to the SCI 1101 table, if done respectfully.

Alex Vyse
Student, 2nd year,
Biomedical Sciences

On 10/18/06, **Alain St-Amant** < Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca > wrote:

Salut,

May I simply point out that tonight's SCI 1101 seminar, according to the course website, is "Jewish Fear and the Palestinian Right of Return" (http://www.alternativevoices.ca/speakers/speakers-2006_en.htm). Guess what guys, the title is needlessly offensive to a significant number of people, and it has no place within the Faculty of Science, and definitely not within SCI 1101 given its course description. I will stand by this statement. If someone would like to argue that such a talk belongs within the Faculty of Science or SCI 1101, I would be happy to debate that fool.

Take care y'all,

Professor Alain St-Amant

Chair, Department of Chemistry

[15]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:[Fwd: RE: SCI 1101, Professor St-Aimant, FYI]
Date:Fri, 27 Oct 2006 16:32:59 -0400
From:Denis Rancourt <dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>
Reply-To:dgr@uottawa.ca
Organization:University of Ottawa
To:Dean of Science <dean@science.uottawa.ca>

Andre:

I want to point out, to help you unravel the situation (see below), that I have never communicated with St-Amant or responded to his messages except to alert the administration. I expect action: I have seen no evidence of responsive management so far.

DGR

----- Original Message -----

Subject:RE: SCI 1101, Professor St-Aimant, FYI
Date:Fri, 27 Oct 2006 16:14:37 -0400
From:Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>
To:<dgr@uottawa.ca>

I thought it was funny.....

I'm detecting a pattern....I write a private e-mail to someone and then it gets forwarded to the President, Vice-Presidents, and Deans. As a man of Science, I'm testing this hypothesis at this very moment.

Professor Alain St-Amant
Chair, Department of Chemistry
University of Ottawa
(613) 562-5769

From: Denis Rancourt [<mailto:dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>]
Sent: October 27, 2006 2:30 PM
To: Gilles Patry; Vice-recteur Etudes; David Mitchell; Dean of Science
Cc: Alain St-Amant; lovelyvegan@hotmail.com; fedecarva@gmail.com; Philippe Marchand;
Physics Chair
Subject: Re: SCI 1101, Professor St-Aimant, FYI

----- Original Message -----

Subject: RE: SCI 1101, Professor St-Aimant

Date: Fri, 27 Oct 2006 13:15:40 -0400

From: Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>

To: <dgr@uottawa.ca>

Whoever this "St-Aimant" person is....he sounds like a really bad apple and we should do something about him pronto!!

Professor Alain St-Amant
Chair, Department of Chemistry
University of Ottawa
(613) 562-5769

From: Denis Rancourt [<mailto:dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>]

Sent: October 27, 2006 12:09 PM

To: Gilles Patry; Vice-recteur Etudes; David Mitchell; Dean of Science

Cc: Alain St-Amant; Alex Vyse; Michel J. Chossudovsky; lovelyvegan@hotmail.com;
fedecarva@gmail.com; Philippe Marchand; Physics Chair

Subject: Re: SCI 1101, Professor St-Aimant

I hereby (see messages below) inform the Executive of the University of Ottawa of yet another response by Professor St-Aimant (below) to yet another valid student concern (below). It seems to me that Professor St-Aimant is repeatedly stepping beyond the bounds of acceptable professional behaviour. I believe that the Executive has a responsibility to attempt to correct this problem. I cannot help but compare the Executive's inaction in this obvious case with the several bogus disciplinary tracks that were recently pursued against me (and dropped without explanation).

I ask for some indication that Professor St-Aimant's continued and unfounded attacks on my teaching will be stopped.

DGR

[16]

----- Original Message -----

Subject:Re: Plainte - Article du Charlatan sur SCI1101

Date:Wed, 25 Oct 2006 00:14:10 -0400

From:Federico Carvajal <fedecarva@gmail.com>

To:Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>

CC:Tammy Kovich <lovelyvegan@hotmail.com>, marchand.philippe@gmail.com, DEANSCI <deansci@uottawa.ca>, Gilles Patry <patry@uottawa.ca>, Robert Major <rmajor@uottawa.ca>, David Mitchell <mitchell@uottawa.ca>, redaction@larotonde.ca, fulweb10@magma.ca, Leonard Kleine <Leonard.Kleine@uottawa.ca>, phychair@science.uottawa.ca, dgr@physics.uottawa.ca, chosso@uottawa.ca, vp.university@sfuo.ca, editor@thefulcrum.ca

References:<35141BE6A60459488367EDBFED55F4FB6501E8@MSMAIL2.uottawa.o.univ>

Professor St-Amant, Mr. Patry, Mr. Major, Tammy, Philippe and those in CC:

It is quite astonishing how an individual can unilaterally terminate a debate and declare a matter closed without responding to clear and honest concerns presented by a University community member.

I've been following this email exchange between Professor Alain St-Amant, Philippe Marchand and Tammy Kovich closely and what has been most upsetting is not the clear close mindedness, uninformed perspective and disrespectful tone of Professor St-Amant but rather the utter silence of those members of our administration that have been on CC throughout this discussion. I'm going to speak not as a TA for the course SCI 1101 but rather as a concerned student and soon-to-be a graduate of this University of Ottawa.

Not only has ample evidence been presented of the unfounded character of Professor St-Amant's comments and accusations (some of which can be easily extracted from his own responses) but the severity of his sweeping statements has been clearly highlighted again and again. It is inconceivable that a Faculty member, the Chairman of the Chemistry Department could make such false accusations, support them with uninformed assumptions, stand by those statements and obtain **no response** from the very people who are supposed to be the guardians of collegial behaviour and academic integrity. (i.e. VP Academic and the President of the University)

As Tammy Kovich has clearly pointed out, if Professor St-Amant would spend more time attending the lectures he has set out to criticize than making uninformed statements, he would find that in fact what he calls "Anti-Semitic" material has been very well-informed, well thought-out and very inclusive analysis of an issue that concerns every citizen of the world and yes, scientists as well.

I'm not a Science student, if I was I would have to agree with Professor St-Amant, I **would be embarrassed**. Embarrassed to be part of a Faculty that instead of embracing the most innovative initiative in education that it has seen in several years devotes its resources (the Chairman of Chemistry's time) to attack such an important student initiative as it is SCI 1101 with its governing body sitting silently while baseless accusations are made repeatedly. It goes to show how much a course like this is needed in the Faculty of Science (thank you for providing more evidence for the existence of this course Professor St-Amant).

I'm in my fourth year of Electrical Engineering, the kind of education I receive in my own faculty is not far from the one obtained in the Faculty of Science. The importance of addressing the very issues that govern our lives from many different angles could not be greater than in the fields of Science and Engineering. It is scientists that conduct the research that is behind most of the major industrial developments we see in the world and Engineers who translate that research into viable technologies. It is scientists that research the properties of depleted uranium and engineers who devise the technology to deliver it in the form of ballistic missiles. It is scientists who are behind the advancing discoveries in genetics and biotech engineers and technicians who deliver them in the form of GMOs... you get my point. Scientists are a social force in our society, and the role of science goes beyond relativity and organic chemistry. Science needs to be in tune with the needs of people. It is people who benefit from it and it is people who suffer from it. This is the spirit of SCI 1101 in the view of a student, to make science accountable, to inform scientists of their effect on society at large and to allow those who are not scientists to understand the problems with science and the changes that need to be made to its current role in society, and how to make these changes.

There is a point in which I fundamentally disagree with Professor St-Amant. He "blames" Professor Denis Rancourt for 100% of the effects of this course. I would like to dispute that, I believe Professor Rancourt has a much lower share of that "blame". This course was obtained through the tireless work of several students, in response to the interest of a few hundred students (remember how many signatures were presented?) and many community members. The 'spirit' of this course does not lie in the hastily-written course description (which was written by Mr. Major himself) to which Professor St-Amant keeps referring to, but rather in the drive for knowledge and critical analysis of the wide range of students and community members that fought so hard to obtain this course. I guess what I'm getting at is that students, community members and yes a Faculty member are equally responsible for the incredible success of this class. A class with one of the highest registration rates in the Faculty of Science, with the highest attendance I've seen during my time at the University of Ottawa, and with an unmatched quality of speakers week after week.

Perhaps Professor St-Amant's comments are the result of some intimidation he might feel. Looking at Science critically rather than submissively can be a frightening experience, especially to scientists who are used to Science being an untouchable vase on a pedestal. Nevertheless, it is still unacceptable that his fear and discomfort with fresh ideas and sober critical analysis would be allowed to be channelled through false

accusations and unfounded attacks.

I hope (most probably in vain) that the members of our Administration wake up. That they realize that what they have on their hands is an out-of-line Chairman making false accusations about the content presented in one of the best courses this University has to offer. A lack of reaction on their part could only be interpreted as complicity in these false accusations or an inability to perform their duties.

To conclude this letter, disrespectful behaviour and false accusations are very serious matters, but silence, complicity and incompetence are much worse.

Best regards,

Federico Carvajal
4th Year Electrical Engineering
fedecarva@gmail.com

On 10/24/06, Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca> wrote:

> Dear Tammy,

>

> For anyone who is interested, I encourage them to read the website that was suggested as background material for last week's lecture (as posted on the course web site). I will simply leave it at that as I can trust people to draw their own conclusions in an appropriate fashion.

>

> In summary, I believe that the lecture you heard last week had as much a fair and balanced treatment of the Middle East conflict as it did have the required scientific content that the course description of SCI 1101 clearly mandates and that is, sadly, continually flouted by those giving the course.

>

> As far as I'm concerned, this issue is closed. I am sorry that Professor Chossudovsky got dragged into this (please note that he was never mentioned in the Charlatan article in question). I would highly encourage Mr. Marchand in the future to respect that private (and subsequently edited) e-mails are private and it is simply poor taste on his part to publicly distribute private comments to the general public.

>

> As for my displeasure with SCI 1101 and its material, I will continue to insist that the course could be a good one if it is given in the fashion that the course description mandates. However, I must also continue to voice my grave concern that, in its present incarnation, the course is an utter embarrassment to the Faculty of Science and the University as a whole. For this, Professor Rancourt is 100% to blame and I hope that he will be held accountable by the University and that this sad scenario will never play itself out again in future years.

>

> As I said, this particular matter is closed as far as I am concerned. I stand by my

comments.

>

> Take care,

>

> Professor Alain St-Amant

> Chair, Department of Chemistry

> University of Ottawa

> (613) 562-5769

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Tammy Kovich [mailto:lovelyvegan@hotmail.com]

> Sent: October 24, 2006 5:59 PM

> To: Alain St-Amant; marchand.philippe@gmail.com; DEANSCI

> Cc: Gilles Patry; Robert Major; David Mitchell; redaction@larotonde.ca;

> fulweb10@magma.ca; Leonard Kleine; phychair@science.uottawa.ca;

> dgr@physics.uottawa.ca; chosso@uottawa.ca; fedecarva@gmail.com;

> vp.university@sfuo.ca

> Subject: RE: Plainte - Article du Charlatan sur SCII101

>

> It is an immensely serious accusation to make the claim the SCII101 includes

> Anti-Semitic material, and thus cannot be taken lightly. While, yes it is

> within an individual's right to free speech to make such a suggestion, it is

> without prudence, and is quite frankly ignorant to make such a statement

> without attending the class. Just as one cannot judge a book by its cover,

> one should not make shocking accusations based upon the title of a lecture.

>

> If, Professor St. Amant had attended the lecture in question, 'Jewish Fear

> and the Palestinian Right to Return' he would have observed a sympathetic

> lecture which discussed the long history of the persecution suffered by the

> Jewish people, and the need for the creation of state in which both Jews and

> Palestinians could live together devoid of the fear of violence and/or

> persecution of any kind. The lecture went on to further describe the need to

> support a peaceful dialogue between Israelis and Palestinians, while working

> to quell any and all prejudices held by Palestinians against Israelis, and

> vice versa.

>

> In regards to the suggested reading, I feel the need to remind Professor St.

> Amant of the definition of Anti- Semitic material; as material which

> discriminates against, is hostile to, or prejudice to the Jewish faith

> promoting hate. While, the article makes controversial statements, they are

> statements based upon the actions of a country and not its religion. Nowhere

> in the article, is there a single criticism of Judaism, nor is there any

> statements linking the Jewish faith to the policies the article critiques.

>

> The article itself takes special note to state that it is not Anti-Semitic

> in nature, is not based upon religious discrimination and makes the point to

> clearly articulate the necessity of viewing political actions through a
> religion neutral lens. Criticizing Israeli policy is not in any way, shape
> or form synonymous with criticizing the Jewish faith, nor is it promoting
> hate. Views critical of Israel are not mutually exclusive to Anti-Semitism.
> To quote the article, which judging from Professor St. Amant's statement he
> did read; "Anti-Semitism has no single political position vis-à-vis Israel".
>
> Sincerely, Tammy Kovich
>
>
>
>>From: "Alain St-Amant" <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>
>>To: "Philippe Marchand" <marchand.philippe@gmail.com>, "DEANSCI"
>><deansci@uottawa.ca>
>>CC: "Gilles Patry" <patry@uottawa.ca>, "Robert Major"
>><rmajor@uottawa.ca>, "David Mitchell" <mitchell@uottawa.ca>, "La Rotonde"
>><redaction@larotonde.ca>, "Drew Gough, Editor-in-Chief, The Fulcrum"
>><fulweb10@magma.ca>, "Leonard Kleine" <Leonard.Kleine@uottawa.ca>, "Richard
>>Hodgson" <phychair@science.uottawa.ca>, "Denis Rancourt"
>><dgr@physics.uottawa.ca>, "Michel Chossudovsky" <chosso@uottawa.ca>, "Tammy
>>Kovich" <lovelyvegan@hotmail.com>, "Federico Carvajal"
>><fedecarva@gmail.com>, "Julien de Bellefeuille" <vp.university@sfuo.ca>
>>Subject: RE: Plainte - Article du Charlatan sur SCII101
>>Date: Tue, 24 Oct 2006 16:08:34 -0400
>>
>>Hi All,
>>
>>As far as I know, Philippe is concerned that I made the comment that the
>>Science content was non-existent and that there were indications that there
>>were anti-Semitic comments made within the course. May I point out that
>>last week's talk was given by a Palestinian-Canadian organization entitled
>>"Jewish Fear and the Palestinian Right of Return"
>>(http://www.alternativevoices.ca/speakers/speakers-2006_en.htm) and that
>>part of the suggested readings deals with (and I quote the course website
>>again) "Israel's genocidal policies against Paslestine (sic)"
>>(http://www.alternativevoices.ca/ac/ac-2006-suggested-readings_en.htm). I
>>therefore stand by my extremely controversial stance that the course does
>>not deal with Science, and that there is material that is anti-Semitic.
>>
>>Philippe was also concerned that I mocked the course for being too easy to
>>pass and that a student need not put in any kind of effort. May I again
>>quote the course website that clearly states that "Nothing" is required to
>>be done and that the final exam is impossible to fail (in fact, NS will not
>>be attributed under any circumstances....so much for that S/NS system that
>>everyone was so keen about)
>>(http://www.alternativevoices.ca/ac/ac-2006-homework_en.htm).

>>
>>If I am missing any points Philippe, could you please raise them and I can
>>point you to the appropriate place on the course's own webpages to justify
>>my free speech?
>>
>>If I offended the professor giving the course in any way, I am truly sorry
>>since I know that he would never ever think of offending anyone at
>>uOttawa....but if a reporter asks me for my impression of the course, I've
>>got to call it like I see it.
>>
>>Take care,
>>
>>Professor Alain St-Amant
>>
>>Chair, Department of Chemistry
>>
>>_____

>>From: Philippe Marchand [mailto:marchand.philippe@gmail.com]
>>Sent: October 24, 2006 2:27 PM
>>To: DEANSCI
>>Cc: Gilles Patry; Robert Major; David Mitchell; La Rotonde; Drew Gough,
>>Editor-in-Chief, The Fulcrum; Alain St-Amant; Leonard Kleine; Richard
>>Hodgson; Denis Rancourt; Michel Chossudovsky; Tammy Kovich; Federico
>>Carvajal; Julien de Bellefeuille
>>Subject: Re: Plainte - Article du Charlatan sur SCI1101
>>
>>(English follows)
>>
>>Bonjour,
>>
>>L'article du Charlatan contenant des fausses accusations est paru il y a
>>presque trois semaines. Je vous ai signalé l'article durant la semaine
>>suivant sa parution et j'ai déposé une plainte formelle (en fichier joint
>>à ce message) la semaine suivante. Le professeur St-Amant a aussi démontré
>>(voir message cité ci-dessous) qu'il entendait poursuivre ses affirmations
>>insultantes sur un cours auquel il n'a jamais assisté.
>>
>>Cela me semble sérieux et j'envoie donc une copie conforme de ce courriel
>>au recteur, au vice-recteur aux études, au vice-recteur aux relations
>>universitaires, aux rédacteurs des deux journaux étudiants du campus et à
>>toutes les étudiantes et étudiants du cours SCI1101, qui je crois sont
>>aussi concernés par cette question.
>>
>>Il y a deux ans, lorsque des accusations sans preuves ont été publiées dans
>>un journal étudiant vis-à-vis la doyenne de la Faculté d'éducation, le

>>recteur a pris moins de deux jours pour envoyer une lettre au journal
>>étudiant concerné. Je suis inquiet que l'Université ne démontre pas le même
>>sérieux lorsque c'est un de ces administrateurs (un directeur de
>>département) qui reconnaît lui-même avoir propagé de fausses accusations.
>>Dois-je comprendre de cette inaction que l'Université appuie les propos
>>d'Alain St-Amant?
>>
>>Je comprends que vous soyez très occupés et hors d'Ottawa pour une partie
>>de la semaine, toutefois je considère que cette question est assez
>>pressante et importante pour qu'au moins vous me référiez à quelqu'un qui
>>pourrait s'en occuper durant votre absence.
>>
>>merci,
>>
>>Philippe Marchand
>>
>>---
>>
>>Hello,
>>
>>The Charlatan article containing false accusations was published almost
>>three weeks ago. I informed you of the article in the week after its
>>publication and I produced a formal complaint (attached to this message)
>>in the following week. Pr. St-Amant also showed (see message below) that he
>>intends to pursue his insulting comments about a class he never attended.
>>
>>This seems serious enough for me to send a copy of this e-mail to the
>>president, the vice-president academic, the vice-president university
>>relations, both student papers' editors and to all students of SC11101,
>>that I believe are also concerned by this affair.
>>
>>Two years ago, when unproved claims were published in a student paper
>>concerning the Dean of Education, the president took less than two days to
>>send a letter to the student paper in question. I am worried that the
>>University doesn't demonstrate the same seriousness when it is one of its
>>administrators (a department Chair) who himself recognizes to have
>>propagated false accusations. Should I consider from this lack of prompt
>>action that the University supports Alain St-Amant's claims?
>>
>>I understand that you are very busy and out of the city for part of the
>>week, however I believe this matter is important and urgent enough for you
>>to at least refer me to someone who could act on it during your leave.
>>
>>thank you,
>>
>>Philippe Marchand

>>
>>
>>On 10/18/06, Alain St-Amant <Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>
>><<mailto:Alain.St-Amant@uottawa.ca>> > wrote:
>>
>>Salut,
>>
>>May I simply point out that tonight's SCI 1101 seminar, according to the
>>course website, is "Jewish Fear and the Palestinian Right of Return"
>>(http://www.alternativevoices.ca/speakers/speakers-2006_en.htm). Guess
>>what guys, the title is needlessly offensive to a significant number of
>>people, and it has no place within the Faculty of Science, and definitely
>>not within SCI 1101 given its course description. I will stand by this
>>statement. If someone would like to argue that such a talk belongs within
>>the Faculty of Science or SCI 1101, I would be happy to debate that fool.
>>
>>Take care y'all,
>>
>>Professor Alain St-Amant
>>
>>Chair, Department of Chemistry
>>
>
>

> Buy, Load, Play. The new Sympatico / MSN Music Store works seamlessly with
> Windows Media Player. Just Click PLAY.
> http://musicstore.sympatico.msn.ca/content/viewer.aspx?cid=SMS_Sept192006
>