

X-Sender: finley@popserver.sfu.ca
Date: Wed, 3 Jan 2001 08:40:23 -0800
To: watt@sfu.ca, bgrant@sfu.ca
From: David Finley <finley@sfu.ca>
Subject: Question One: Revised

Question Number One

The issue of Administrator responsibility for disciplinary actions has recently been raised by various professors accusing administrators of misconduct in their dealings with them and with others.

There are specific mechanisms for punishing students who go astray as we well know. There seem to be a variety of policies for punishing erring professors on top of which the Administration also assumes the right to use ad hoc procedures when the others are too burdensome or fail to fit. There are also procedures for disciplining staffpersons. Yet I am not aware of any such procedures for disciplining Administrators who abuse or violate the rights of their employees.

Questions

- (a) Is there any mechanism accessible to the faculty or staff for charging, investigating, and disciplining administrators who violate the rights of employees or students?
- (b) What are the circumstances where administrators need to account to the public and possible victims for allegations of misconduct in administering disciplinary procedures?

David Finley
Simon Fraser University (604-291-4604)
email: finley@sfu.ca
website: www.sfu.ca/~finley/

David Finley, 1/3/01 9:30 AM -0800, Question Number Two: Revised

X-Sender: finley@popserver.sfu.ca
Date: Wed, 3 Jan 2001 09:30:55 -0800
To: watt@sfu.ca, bgrant@sfu.ca
From: David Finley <finley@sfu.ca>
Subject: Question Number Two: Revised

Question Number Two

This concerns the Donnelly case. This case resulted in an innocent person being publicly denounced as being guilty of sexual assault and fired with cause after his case had been pending for 18 months. During this time the administration had ample opportunity to determine whether the case against him was sound. Yet within ten weeks of Donnelly's dismissal, the Administration conceded that there had been major procedural irregularities, which were known to the Administration and withheld from Donnelly.

The Administration also conceded that the principal accuser had made inconsistent statements in her submissions and therefore could not be considered a credible witness. Moreover, a careful reading of the Panel Report reveals that evidence of Donnelly's guilt was conspicuous by its absence and that improper reasoning, bogus evidence, and prejudice against the accused were conspicuously present. Further it is apparent that all the above information was known or should have been known to the Administration, since none of it depended on anything subsequently introduced by Donnelly.

The above information would indicate, not only that the case was grossly mishandled, but would strongly suggest that there was serious and possibly egregious misconduct on the part of the Administrators dealing with this case. In view of these circumstances, I am asking the following:

- (a) Why has there been no independent investigation to determine what went wrong?
- (b) Why has there been no public reporting of what went wrong and why has the Administration reneged on its previous pledge (made by then President Stubbs) to provide a full explanation?
- (c) Why has there been no effort to identify and punish those responsible for this ethical failure?
- (d) Why has there been no institutional apology to Donnelly for both the unwarranted finding of guilt and the numerous willful violations of his rights perpetrated by the Administration?
- (e) Why has Donnelly received no compensation for suffering (which must have been substantial), where in contrast, even dubious sexual harassment complainants have been liberally compensated?
- (f) Are there any plans to consider any of the actions implied by the above questions?

- end -

Albert Chan,28 01 01 10:37 PM -0700,Question for Senate's February meeting..

X-Apparently-From: <aytchan@yahoo.com>
From: "Albert Chan" <aytchan@yahoo.com>
To: "Alison Watt" <Alison_Watt@sfu.ca>, <bgrant@sfu.ca>
Subject: Question for Senate's February meeting.....
Date: Sun, 28 Jan 2001 22:37:41 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

Dear Alison and Bobbie,

I plan to raise the following item in person for the Question Period of the February Senate meeting:

"Pursuant to Senate Rules and the University Act, Senators should be informed on the significant issues affecting the university. Underfunding is one of our serious problems. As a convocation senator, I regret to realize that our own university was forced into an arbitration with our student society over a maintenance cost dispute on the rental agreement of the Maggie Benston Building. Money was spent by both sides on unnecessary costs, instead of spending on endeavours that could be more beneficial for the university community. Fortunately, the arbitrator has concluded the dispute and apparently seems to rule in favour of our university. My question for Mr. Chair is how much money have we spent on resolving this issue? Is the dispute finalized? Also, could Mr. Chair or another member of the administration please explain to us the background of this dispute and disclose all available information, particularly factual details, except those marked confidential?"

Best regards,

Albert

Albert Chan - aytchan@yahoo.com
Web: www.geocities.com/aytchan/

Do You Yahoo!?

Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>

X-Apparently-From: <aytchan@yahoo.com>
From: "Albert Chan" <aytchan@yahoo.com>
To: "Alison Watt" <Alison_Watt@sfu.ca>, <bgrant@sfu.ca>
Subject: Second question for Feb. Senate meeting....
Date: Tue, 30 Jan 2001 18:55:09 -0700
MIME-Version: 1.0
X-Priority: 3 (Normal)
X-MSMail-Priority: Normal
Importance: Normal
X-MimeOLE: Produced By Microsoft MimeOLE V5.00.2919.6600

This question is related to the five year capital plan and the robotic book storage system for the library.

Our university's capital budget has been frozen by the government for over five years. In July 2000, the Board of Governors approved the newest capital plan, which included a robotic storage system for the library. The plan was submitted to the provincial government for consideration. Could Mr. Chair report on the status of our capital plan and whether there is any progress for new capital funding allocation?

The Senate Library Committee had some discussion on the robot system in 1998. With the assumption that no money was secured for any library expansion project and that the robotic book storage system costs only a portion of a conventional library system, the SLC encouraged the library administration to pursue this endeavour.

However, many library users, including faculty members, students and librarians are not happy with the fact that this new library expansion approach diminishes their ability to browse through books on the shelves.

Our overall book collection is already the lowest among other benchmark institutions according to the library annual report. We are currently highly depended on inter-library loans to supplement our research needs. Building a robotic storage system, instead of constructing a new library building could mean further enlarge our competitive disadvantage. Besides, it is always a good idea to aim at a higher and better target.

Given that we have a new senior university administration and that we may face a new provincial government in the near future, what is our administration's view on this subject matter?

What are the administration's lobbying and fund-raising directions? Is the administration ready to revisit the robotic storage idea and perhaps try to lobby for more capital development funding on building a new library, similar to what UBC did when it built its new Koerner library?

Best regards,

Albert Chan
Convocation Senator

Do You Yahoo!?
Get your free @yahoo.com address at <http://mail.yahoo.com>