

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN SENATE
Senate Executive Committee
(Final; Action)

SC.12.10 Senate Statement on Ethical Leadership and Shared Governance

The release of the Investigative Report on Jan. 13, 2012 documents a broad pattern of surveillance and intrusion into legitimate faculty governance deliberations. As the main text and appendices of that Report make clear, the attempts of the President's Chief of Staff to undermine shared governance through her anonymous emails were but one symptom of a more generalized culture of leaked documents, suspicion, and intimidation that the President tolerated and participated in (see attached documentation).

Faculty, students, and staff members from all over this institution share our concern that the fraudulent emails sent by the President's Chief of Staff do not represent an isolated event, and that the problems documented in the report will not be solved simply by her departure.

As elected faculty, staff, and student leaders, we believe that there must be accountability for this broader failure of leadership. Ethical leadership, we believe, means patiently building consensus for reform, not mandating it as an act of command; it means respectfully engaging honest disagreements, not trying to eliminate them; and it means working with campus leaders and faculty as partners in governance, not as subordinates to be ordered to action.

Unfortunately, the pattern of behavior documented in the Investigative Report falls far short of this ideal of ethical leadership. It does not reflect our view of the appropriate relationship between the university administration and campus communities, and it does not represent our view of this university and its values.

This is not the Illinois way.

Senate Executive Committee

Matthew Wheeler, Chair

Joyce Tolliver, Vice-Chair

Abbas Aminmansour

Richard Atterberry

Robert Brunner

Nicholas Burbules

Roy Campbell

Bettina Francis

Kim Graber

Kaitlyn Hastings

Harry Hilton

Peter Hughes

William Maher

Jim Maskeri

Gay Miller

Sarah Projansky

DOCUMENTATION

1 Appendix 15, Investigative Report: December 10 email from President Hogan to Chairman Kennedy, summarizing his directives to the Chancellors and University Senates Conference Chair to support the enrollment management recommendations. It includes an email (from Michael Biehl, member of the USC Task Force drafting its report) anonymously forwarded by UIS professor Tih-Fen Ting that, Hogan claims, shows that the campuses are hopelessly divided and that UIUC is “pressuring” the other campuses to accept its report “with the aim of forcing a confrontation”:

From: Hogan, Michael
To: ckennedy@mmart.com;
Subject: follow on enrollment management
Date: Saturday, December 10, 2011 1:29:50 PM

Chris,

I mentioned you yesterday on the phone that I was having a very serious conversation with our chancellors on enrollment management. You wanted an update on the meeting and here’s how it went. I made a couple of adjustments in order to make the enrollment management plan more palpable to the chancellors, but without compromising the authority of the president and effective implementation of the recommendations.

I stated as strongly as I could that the Board and I had endorsed the new plan and expected them to follow suit and to so inform their provosts, deans, enrollment management staff, and their senate leadership, including the chair of the senates conference. I asked them to issue that communication within 48 hours. I’ll give you an update at the end of that period.

I also let Don Chambers know that I’d already received all three campus reports on the enrollment management report and that UIC and UIS seemed mostly accepting of the report, while UIUC was oppositional. Consequently, I expected to receive the independent reports from each campus regarding their concerns with the enrollment management plans, in keeping with the statutes, which require that USC report differences when there is no consensus.

Today, however, I received information anonymously (following my sign off) that a confrontation may be being staged. The fact is that I have three responses to the enrollment management report that show relative agreement between UIS and UIC, with UIUC the outlier as nearly completely oppositional and whose report is copied nearly word-for-word as the Senates Conference draft response. As the e-mail below shows, the UIUC delegation is trying to pressure others to accept it as the official response with the aim of forcing a confrontation.

I remain optimistic that the Chancellors will re-direct their campuses, but this is clearly disturbing.

Please let me know if you have any suggestions for addressing this.

Best,
Mike

Michael J. Hogan
President

University of Illinois



>One of the things I and Nick have been trying to promote is that we
>don't have a UIUC view, a UIC view, and a UIS view on the President's EM proposals,
>but rather a united, joint, consensus view. Our USC report should and does
>present a joint, united front between the UIUC and UIC reps in a
>report format and revised/edited consensus conclusions that have
>already been broadly accepted and praised as a "thoughtful, reasoned
>report" by UIUC administrators and Senate, and from what I am hearing, UIC >administrators.

>
>If we present our report in a similar format and conclusions as a
>joint, UNITED UIUC/UIC view (UIS is a wild card), the President will
>be compelled to listen and collaborate. If he still chooses not to at
>that point, I don't think we can hold back any longer those that want
>to escalate this into a full confrontation with him. If we present it
>as a non-united "UIUC thinks this, UIC thinks this, and UIS thinks
>this" he can easily say "faculty are divided so I am going forward
>with implementation".....I don't think that is what we want and in my
>opinion, will result in an operational and public relations disaster for all campuses and >this university.

>
>Therefore, I would suggest the USC reps from each campus make sure the
>USC report presents their campus perspective within the consensus
>views, and that we NOT place each individual campus report on a site
>for everyone to view and focus on their differences. That's what I
>was taught consensus-building is,,,,,giving up your exact, specific,
>individual viewpoints for united, joint viewpoints that you and all other participants can >ACCEPT.

2 Appendix 16, Investigative Report: Two texts drafted by President Hogan on Dec. 10, 2011, and sent to Chairman Kennedy to be mailed out under his name to University Senates Conference chair Don Chambers and the Chancellors, asserting that the enrollment recommendations “represent Board policy”:

Don,

I’m writing t regarding the Board’s and President’s plans to begin implementation of the enrollment management recommendations.

There are serious problems in enrollment management on all three campuses -- we are not enrolling enough minorities, financial aid packages are inadequate and poorly executed, there is unnecessary competition across the campuses when it comes to recruiting, in general our yields are poor, our marketing is not competitive with other institutions, and there are costly redundancies and poor coordination in our operations across the campuses.

This is why we supported the president’s initiative to conduct an external review of enrollment management, the recommendations coming out of that review, and the appointment of an executive director to coordinate and direct our efforts across the University.

We have charged the president with implementing those recommendations as one of his high priority goals for the year, and the chancellors are prepared to support that goal. In short, the recommendations represent Board policy, as well as the President’s goal. The two should be viewed as inseparable and we hope that the Conference will not find itself at odds with what the trustees, as well as the President, are trying to do.

I ask that you share this with your colleagues in the Senates Conference. I think it’s important for them to know the Board’s interest in moving forward on this as expeditiously as possible.

Sincerely,
Chris

Dear Paula, Susan, and Phyllis,

Saturday night over dinner, Mike mentioned that he had been meeting with you to work through implementation plans for advancing our enrollment management operations. He told me that he and the chancellors had come to terms and that you are now prepared to lead your campuses in the implementation.

Since taking office, the trustees have been concerned about our enrollment trends – lower yields, decreasing diversity, inadequate financial aid, unnecessary competition and costly redundancies across our campuses. This is why we approved the appointment of an executive director of enrollment management and asked Mike to have our operations reviewed. We endorsed the report that the review team generated and charged Mike with implementing it as one of his key goals for the year, including the appointment of an executive director of enrollment management, who will coordinate and direct our efforts across the University.

I’m pleased to hear that you are conveying to your campuses that implementing these recommendations is a high priority for the Board, as reflected in Mike’s goals, and I want to thank you for your leadership on this

important initiative.

Sincerely,
Chris

3 On December 12, 2011, all three chancellors issued similarly-worded email messages to their campus constituents expressing broad support of the enrollment management initiative.

4 Appendix 1, Investigative Report: email from “UI Integrity,” in which Lisa Troyer asserts, “I find the coercive nature of forcing consensus where it clearly does not exist very troubling. . . . Using tactics of coercion, threats, and bullying to drive away disagreement are not what we are or should be about” and “I’m also disturbed by the comments of some that the purpose of conveying consensus (whether real or false) is to avoid appearing weak or to avoid strengthening the president’s position.” The email also discourages the Conference from looking into who leaked internal documents to the President. The Investigative Report shows that, before the President received these documents, USC member Tih-Fen Ting leaked them to the President’s Chief of Staff:

From: About UIIntegrity [<mailto:aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com>]

[<mailto:aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 11:56 AM

To: Leff, Carol Skalnik; Switzer, Carrie L; Erricolo, Danilo; Chambers, Donald A.; Francis, George K; Gibori, Geula; Martin, John C.; ANDERSEN, KENNETH E; Graber, Kim C; Mohammadian, Kouros; Struble, Leslie J; Mallory, Mary; Wheeler, Matthew B; O'Brien, Nancy Patricia; Burbules, Nicholas C; Patston, Philip A.; Campbell, R H; Fadavi, Shahrbanoo; Ting, Tih-Fen; Shanahan, Timothy

Subject: call for reason and honesty

Dear Colleagues,

I’ve observed the traffic between us these last weeks, without jumping into it. It is traffic that grows increasingly perilous and collisions between members of the conference have become a daily matter of fact.

I write anonymously, because I see the public finger-pointing and thinly veiled threats to personal and professional reputations toward those who dissent by a scarce few among us. I can’t afford such public and personal attacks at this time in my scholarly career. But, I feel compelled to express my dismay at what we have become and what we are tolerating in this governance body.

Let me note that I believe that the president most likely received the draft report of our committee from an outside source. So let us stop accusing one another. The draft report had already been shared by members of our conference with more than one outside source to try to garner support from others who are not Conference members. Conference members have admitted as much. But it was a poor calculation. It might not be difficult for us to track down those who distributed it outside our ranks or who distributed it to the president, although I think we best let it rest.

I need to say that like some others, I find the coercive nature of forcing consensus where it clearly does not exist very troubling. It’s not surprising that some decided to resign from the committee rather than become unwilling collaborators in such an exercise. I do believe we should always do our best to find consensus, but when we don’t, we need to recognize it. The statutes require us to convey all campus positions openly and honestly when there is a disagreement. Using tactics of coercion, threats, and bullying to drive away disagreement are not what we are or should be about.

I appreciate that some have worked hard to try to find a consensus, but those good efforts have not been successful. Pretending consensus exists when it does not will undermine the credibility of our body. We need to be transparent and honest in sharing the points of disagreement in any final document we issue. I agree with some others that appending individual campus reports is the best solution in the interest of

integrity and transparency. We should not be afraid to be open and honest about our disagreements. I'm also disturbed by the comments of some that the purpose of conveying consensus (whether real or false) is to avoid appearing weak or to avoid strengthening the president's position. There is nothing weak about a lack of consensus if that is the case. There is strength in honesty; there is weakness in dishonesty. We don't serve our offices well by covering up reality.

Finally, the public comments by some on this body who are degrading other campuses and other individuals in public meetings and in the press are unbecoming and perhaps even unethical. No campus is better than others; no individual is better than others. We are all equals and it is time to start treating one another with respect and to exercise integrity in carrying out our statutory duties. We can respectfully disagree and there is much honor in respectfulness.

Senator

5 Appendix 6, Investigative Report: excerpt from report on December 5, 2011 UIUC Senate meeting, by Jan Dennis, Asst. Director of University Relations. Writing to the President, Dennis summarizes the Senate's discussion of the UIUC Task Force Report on the enrollment management recommendations:

By way of summary, there was apparent unanimous support that enrollment management should remain with campuses. There also was a strong sense that the administration is making decisions in a move toward centralization, and then bypassing the Senate, or approaching the Senate and telling them what will be done, without seeking input. The enrollment management plan, as Business Administration professor Mark Roszkowski alleged, is the third time the Senate has been effectively cut out of the process, following reorganization and IT consolidation.

Roszkowski advocated drawing a line in the sand, saying a faculty-administration confrontation is inevitable, and the sooner the better. His comments were greeted with applause.

Mike Biehl, chairman of the task force, discouraged that approach. He called for fostering faculty collaboration with administration and the Board of Trustees . . .

Ruth Watkins, dean of LAS: Ruth said the composition of undergraduates – where they're from, their achievements, their demographics, etc. – are one of the most important decisions a campus makes and should remain a campus decision, with the provost's office as the final authority. The makeup of undergraduates is a big part of a campus's identity, she said. She also said that some of the recommendations in the consultant's report are "under specific." . . .

6 Appendix 7, Investigative Report: Dec. 5 email from Lisa Troyer to Avijit Ghosh, on Hogan's behalf, referencing the Dennis report:

Mike's would like your thoughts about a couple of things:

(1) The "line in the sand" comments and assertions that there needs to be a "confrontation" with Mike -- this is troubling, even though Biehl and others discouraged it;

(2) Would it be worth visiting with Ruth Watkins (and subsequently other deans)? We're wondering how many of those who commented here actually read the entire external review report and/or whether they are basing their understanding solely on the task force report -- there seems to be a lot of misunderstandings here about what is being recommended.

Z Chronology of events, documented by the Appendices from the Investigative Report; USC/SEC liaison reports; USC minutes and emails; and, in the case of the President's phone call, by the direct report of USC Chair Don Chambers, who received it:

Between late October and the release of the anonymous e-mails, the President repeatedly insisted that the Conference's report should only address the narrow question of the role of faculty in admissions and whether that role would be affected by his proposals. He said that he did not want a point-by-point review of the recommendations in the external consultants' report. This effort to direct and delimit what the Conference could address in its report was at odds with the spirit of shared governance, with the Conference's statutory responsibilities to review academic policy matters, and with the President's own requests for just such a broader review on April 29, August 31, and again on October 18 (USC Minutes).

Then, on November 17, the President met with the full University Senates Conference and angrily chastised the Conference members, including the chair of the task force working on the draft report, when he learned that they were attempting to produce a consensus document across the three separate senate statements – as is also the Conference's statutory responsibility. This same complaint was echoed in the anonymous December 12 e-mails.

During that meeting, the President also complained about the Conference members' communicating with each other in "late into the evening" phone calls and e-mails. This theme advanced by the President – that there was something inappropriate and conspiratorial in the Conference's efforts to seek to develop a consensus report – was a recurring element in a number of e-mails between Tih-Fen Ting and Lisa Troyer, and the December 12 e-mails themselves.

On Friday December 9, the University Senates Conference was scheduled to vote on a draft report from its task force. The President had received a copy of the draft report that was improperly forwarded by Tih-Fen Ting, even though the Conference had explicitly agreed that no drafts would be shared with others until the group was ready to issue its final report. Upon receiving the leaked draft, the President contacted the Chair of the Conference, and in an irate phone call attempted to pressure him to alter the report.

Over the course of that weekend the President continued his effort to suppress opposition to the enrollment management proposals from the Chancellors and faculty leaders. In his December 10 e-mail to Chair Kennedy, the President summarizes his communications with the Chancellors, saying,

I stated as strongly as I could that the Board and I had endorsed the new plan and expected them to follow suit and to so inform their provosts, deans, enrollment management staff, and their senate leadership, including the chair of the senates conference. I asked them to issue that communication within 48 hours.

In addition to this, he then drafted letters to the Chancellors and to the full Conference, enjoining these parties to drop their objections to the enrollment management proposals. The letter the President drafted for the Conference concluded,

In short, the recommendations represent Board policy, as well as the President's goal. The two should be viewed as inseparable and we hope that the Conference will not find itself at odds with what the trustees, as well as the President, are trying to do.

That letter was sent on December 11, the Chancellor statements all appeared on December 12, and on that same day the anonymous e-mails were sent to the Conference by Chief of Staff Troyer, posing as a member, trying to exacerbate divisions within the Conference and discouraging it from producing a consensus report on the enrollment management proposals.

The question of direct knowledge or responsibility by the President for these e-mails needs to be subsumed under the wider question of his involvement in a clear effort to divide and intimidate the Conference, and to interfere with its efforts to produce an advisory report. *Even if Chief of Staff Troyer concocted the December 12 e-mails alone, her efforts were in the service of this wider strategy. They were not an isolated or totally individual act.*

8 On December 21, 2011, the University Senates Conference approved its consensus report on the enrollment management proposals, by a 13-2 vote. It was unanimously supported by the UIC members and by all but one of the UIUC members.