

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

MINUTES
CAMPUS SENATE MEETING
AY 2011-2012
FRIDAY, January 27, 2012
10:00 A.M. – 12: P.M.
PAC CONFERENCE ROOM “G”

Senators Present: L. Atkinson, D. Ballard, P. Boltuc, D. Bussell, L. Fisher, R. Garmil, T. Helton, C. Hoelscher, K. Jamison, W. Kline, X. Li, A. Mulvey, J. Case-Pease, D. Ruez, P. Salela, D. Schuldt, G. Simo, A. Sisneros, J. Tienken, J. Villegas, P. Wassenberg, E. Wilson, Y. Zhang, S. Miller, C. Switzer, K. Sheridan, T. Ting presiding through the end of the approval of the agenda, and J. Martin presiding from the end of the approval of the agenda to the meeting adjournment.

Senators Absent:

Ex-Officio: Lynn Pardie

Guests: Normajean Niebur; Kathy DeBarr; Don Mitchell; Rebecca Landsberg; Kati Maseman; Nithya Karuppaswamy; Emily Roberts; Amy Hawkins; Kerry Poynter; Juanita Ortiz; Jason Pierceson; Michael Murphy; Kent Redfield; Ed Wojcicki; Ron McNeil; Cecilia Cornell; Sharron LaFollette; Karen Kirkendall; Dan Mauters; Keith Burton; James Ermatinger; Bill Martz; Donna Hayes; Harsh Bapat; Aleta Carlberg; Bob Skorczewski; Kathryn Kleeman; Lori Giordano; Lenore Killam; Ken Runkle; Scott Day; Barbara Cass; Holly Thompson; Evan Stanley; Brian Clevenger; Carolyn Schloemann; Rebecca Prather; Tery Bodenhorn; Deborah Anthony; Josiah Alamu; Wendy Johnson; Stephen Schnebly; Michael Lemke; Heather Bailey; Beverly Bunch; Baker Siddiquee; Denise Sommers; Jay Gilliam; Jennifer Manthei; Rassule Hadidi; James Hall; Ryan Williams; Heather Dell; Sheryl Reminger; and 2 un-decipherable signatures on the guest sign in

Approval of the Agenda

The meeting was called to order by T. Ting at 10:00 a.m. T. Ting announced she had three amendments to the agenda. The first proposed amendment was for T. Ting to make comments to the recent developments regarding the anonymous e-mails investigative report. The second amendment was to introduce a motion for the Senate to vote confidence or no confidence in the chair. The third issue introduced by T. Ting was in regards to who would preside over the meeting. Since the chair was the topic of discussion, T. Ting indicated that the vice chair J. Martin should preside over the meeting. T. Ting entertained a motion from the floor to amend the agenda.

A motion to amend the agenda was made by J. Martin and was seconded by X. Li.

A. Sisneros asked if the vote needed to be by ballot.

T. Ting clarified that the task at hand was a vote on an amendment which does not need to be by ballot; rather, a simple majority vote.

A. Sisneros indicated that all voting should be by secret ballot.

T. Ting replied that was not the case in regards to approval of a motion to change to the agenda.

A. Sisneros requested that his objection be noted in the record.

R. Garmil asked for clarification regarding whether or not there would be discussion.

52
53 T. Ting called for discussion.
54
55 L. Fisher requested that T. Ting restate the proposed amendments.
56
57 T. Ting indicated that she would first like to speak to the recent developments. Second, and after her
58 statement, she would like to introduce a motion for the Senators to vote confidence or no confidence in
59 her as chair. Since the subject of discussion is her, she would like to delegate to John Martin to preside
60 over the meeting.
61 A. Sisneros asked if the statement to be made by T. Ting constituted as discussion and, if so, shouldn't
62 that occur after the vote?
63
64 T. Ting clarified that after her statement, anyone could ask questions. She clarified that following that, she
65 would introduce a motion for a vote of confidence.
66
67 J. Martin indicated that, as presiding officer, he would assume that there would be discussion of any
68 motion brought to the floor today.
69
70 T. Ting called for a vote on the motion to change the agenda. The motion passed with 15 yes votes, 0 no
71 votes and 13 abstentions (T. Helton, P. Wassenberg, G. Simo, L. Fisher, A. Sisneros, D. Ballard, S.
72 Miller, J. Tienken, W. Kline, P. Boltuc, P. Salela; R. Garmil, and D. Ruez).
73
74 J. Martin clarified that the agenda was accepted as amended, with a statement from Dr. Ting first, a vote
75 of confidence or no confidence to follow, and then the agenda as published.
76
77 L. Fisher proposed a second amendment to the agenda which would add Resolution 41-28. This
78 resolution was distributed to senators on Thursday, January 26 via email and hard copies of the resolution
79 were distributed to senators at today's meeting.
80
81 J. Martin indicated that for clarification, that number had not been assigned to the resolution by any
82 committee of the Senate.
83
84 L. Fisher indicated that the resolution was being introduced by her and Sen. Sisneros. L Fisher made a
85 motion that the resolution be the first order of business. The resolution allowed for a statement by chair T.
86 Ting as well as a vote of confidence by secret ballot to be made at this, the January 27, 2012 meeting.
87
88 J. Martin asked for clarification as to whether the resolution would appear before or after the Chair's
89 statement.
90
91 L. Fisher indicated that the resolution being introduced would appear after the Chair's statement on
92 today's agenda. The resolution constitutes the resolution for the vote of confidence.
93
94 J. Martin entertained a motion from the floor, which was made by A. Sisneros and was seconded by W.
95 Kline.
96
97 As a point of privilege, J. Martin indicated that none of the motions being added to the agenda today have
98 been vetted by any committee of the Senate and that senators should understand that this is going forward
99 without the normal process.
100
101 A. Sisneros requested that J. Martin make the statement again.
102

103 J. Martin indicated that this is going forward without any vetting from senate committee, as would
104 normally occur for any motion coming to the Senate.

105
106 J. Martin called for a vote and the motion carried with 18 yes votes, 1 no vote, and 9 abstentions (P.
107 Wassenberg, J. Tienken, D. Ballard, A. Mulvey, S. Miller, J. Villegas, C. Switzer, C. Hoelscher, and D.
108 Ruez).

109
110 J. Martin entertained a motion from the floor to approve the agenda. A motion to approve the agenda was
111 made by R. Garmil and was seconded by E. Wilson. The motion carried with 22 yes votes, 0 no votes and
112 6 abstentions (P. Wassenberg, D. Ballard, S. Miller, J. Villegas, J. Tienken, D. Ruez).

113
114 **Statement by Senate Chair- T. Ting**

115
116 “To those who have remained open-minded regarding the investigative report over the anonymous e-
117 mails of December 12, 2011 and who are willing to listen, things are continuing to unfold as many FOIA
118 requests have been made. Other parties are now involved and much information was omitted from the
119 report. I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the recent developments and the report. First,
120 nothing I forwarded to the president's chief of staff was confidential. In fact, it is commonplace for
121 members of the University's Senates Conference to communicate privately with the president, his Chief of
122 Staff, or members of his senior administrative team. Before the report was released, the University's
123 counsel affirmed that I did nothing wrong with those communications. I, along with the other Springfield
124 delegates to the University's Senates Conference, have kept the Senate informed of the problems and
125 difficulties within the conference. One major problem is the coerced, false consensus (unintelligible- one
126 word) informed of problems within the University's Senates Conference. They themselves have seen
127 some of those USC communications. I was not the subject of the anonymous e-mails investigation. I was
128 asked to help shed light on the situation. One of the questions that you may be asking, why did I choose to
129 forward non-confidential USC communications to the Pres.'s Chief of Staff from an anonymous e-mail
130 account, uiadvocate@gmail.com? First of all, it was a decision I had thought hard about and I told no one
131 of my decision. I chose to use anonymous e-mail account, in part, so that those emails or concerns
132 expressed would not automatically be discounted or written off as simply a UIS concern, since UIS has
133 been increasingly marginalized within the conference. Secondly, I also did not want those e-mails to be
134 discounted because I did not want them to be seen as some kind of personal vendetta resulting from the
135 contested vice chair election for the conference. I had no idea how or when those e-mails might come to
136 light, but I feared that if the e-mails were seen to come directly from me, some University's Senates
137 Conference members would claim that the president told or asked me to send them. Now, I'll admit that
138 this can probably only be understood in light of the tensions in the University's Senates Conference that I
139 mentioned a minute ago. In fact, the president had nothing to do with it. Regarding my initial denial of
140 my use of the uiadvocate email account, within the context of the questions they were asking, it seemed to
141 me they were trying to implicate the president. However, as I just said, the president had nothing to do
142 with it. He was never involved, and I did not want to implicate him so my initial gut reaction was to deny
143 responsibility. It's unfortunate the report used the phrase, ‘when further confronted, however, she
144 acknowledged having done so’ because there was no hostility involved during the interview. The
145 investigator told me I did nothing wrong, the University simply needed my help. I was told the University
146 would like to know every detail including who owned the uiadvocate email account in the event of any
147 future FOIA request from the press about this account, so they would know who to ask. After their
148 explanation, I felt comfortable acknowledging that I had sent the messages. Senators Lynn Fisher and
149 Tony Sisneros visited me in my office on Tuesday afternoon they asked me if I would step down as the
150 Senate chair. I told them I would not step down as if it indicates I did something wrong because I did
151 nothing wrong. However, if the majority of the senators decide that they no longer have confidence in me
152 to continue chairing the Senate to the end of my term, I will be glad to step down. I also told Senator
153 Fisher and Senator Sisneros that I had already decided to resign from the University's Senates

154 Conference; a discussion that John Martin, Carrie Switzer, and I already had before the investigative
155 report came out. I stand by what I did. However, as the Senate chair, in order to be effective, I need to
156 have the support of the senators. Therefore, as the Senate chair, I have no problem introducing a motion
157 to have the senator's vote for confidence or no confidence in me via secret ballot. If the majority of the
158 senators decide that they have no confidence in me to finish my term as the Senate chair that ends in
159 April, I will resign from the campus Senate and the University Senates Conference effective immediately.
160 Thank you."

161
162 J. Martin called for questions.

163
164 A. Sisneros asked T. Ting to clarify whether she said she had an impulse to deny involvement initially.

165
166 T. Ting clarified that given the context of the questions they were asking it seems that they were trying to
167 implicate the president. Her gut reaction was to deny her responsibility because she did not want to
168 implicate the president, simply because the president had nothing to do with the anonymous e-mail that
169 she used.

170
171 A. Sisneros asked, "If he had nothing to do with it, why were you concerned with implicating him?"

172
173 T. Ting replied, "I just said, I don't know, in my statement I said, I don't know when or how those emails
174 would come to light". But I feared it does e-mails came to late as coming from me, given the tensions
175 within the USC, I feared that some USC members would claim that the president told me or asked me to
176 do so but in fact he had done no such thing. That's why my initial hesitation. But then they explained to
177 me they simply want my help, I did nothing wrong, they only wanted to know every detail so that the
178 university could prepare in the event for any future FOIA requests from the press specifically about this
179 account so they know who to ask.

180
181 A. Sisneros asked were the current presiding officer and the Parliamentarian, did you make them aware as
182 members of the Executive committee, did you make them aware that you were communicating in this
183 way?

184
185 T. Ting clarified that she just said that she thought hard about her decision and that she told no one of her
186 decision. Only she knew that she had this account.

187
188 L. Fisher said thank you to T. Ting for having prepared such a clear statement which addressed many of
189 the questions that senators had. It shows that she is taking these concerns seriously. L. Fisher referred to
190 T. Ting's comments that things were still unfolding. She asked T. Ting to clarify whether or not that
191 meant there was any question as to whether or not T. Ting was responsible for sending the emails from
192 the uiadvocate account.

193
194 T. Ting clarified that there was no question about that being her action. She told the investigators that she
195 was the owner of that e-mail account.

196
197 L. Fisher commented that, to her, that was the most important point, and that the whole complex of other
198 people's actions was of less importance for our body. L. Fisher referenced T. Ting's comments regarding
199 the difficult and tense situation with the USC, and the fact that T. Ting was chair of the UIS Senate might
200 have meant that she felt her comments would be taken less seriously. That was part of T. Ting's
201 motivation for sending communications anonymously. L. Fisher asked T. Ting if she had accurately
202 understood T. Ting's comments.

203

204 T. Ting clarified that yes, she did not want her comments to be automatically discounted as some personal
205 vendetta as a result of the contested vice chair election.
206

207 L. Fisher commented that the Senate has had several conversations about those difficulties. However, she
208 asked to focus solely on the issue of the anonymous emails. L. Fisher asked if T. Ting expected that the
209 comments sent anonymously would be taken more seriously than those signed by the UIS Senate chair.
210

211 T. Ting replied that she really didn't know. She commented that she talked to the President, she talked to
212 the chief of staff, she talked to the Chancellor, and she talked to the Provost. They all knew the problems.
213 T. Ting commented that she didn't know because she simply put forth her comments as the UI advocate.
214 In her view, even though the UIS delegates had been increasingly marginalized by the conference, but the
215 fact that the coerced confidentiality, coerced secrecy and inappropriate invocation of executive session
216 during the USC meeting is actually a larger problem than just for UIS and that's the reason why she really
217 didn't know whether it would be taken seriously. She thought she wanted to keep the people outside of the
218 conference involved and she gave her reasons why she used anonymous e-mails. She is happy to repeat
219 those reasons, but that was the circumstances she was in and that was the conclusion she derived at that
220 time. It seemed the best thing for her to do at that time.
221

222 L. Fisher asked if T. Ting thought that using anonymous outside e-mails coming from privately
223 established e-mail accounts is an appropriate way to conduct communications as the UIS senate chair and
224 member of the Senates conference.
225

226 T. Ting replied that it depends on the context. She said she didn't know whether senators were aware that
227 anonymous emails are likely used all the time and all around. Certainly when she communicates with the
228 Chancellor and the Provost, she printed out those e-mails and showed them to them and they could read it
229 and know that they were from her. Because of the tension between a few USC members and the president,
230 and there's a reason why we have had a contested vice chair election. She wasn't exactly sure why, but
231 there was some fixation on her. She feared, she didn't want to give anybody the opportunity to say that the
232 president told her or asked her to do so. But one has to understand the tension within the conference and
233 how she felt that she was the subject or the target all the time- all the time. She doesn't know how that got
234 spun around. The fact is that nothing that was shared with the campus administration or forwarded to the
235 president's chief of staff was confidential. When she met with the Chancellor and the Provost she did
236 show them some of those e-mails printed out directly from her e-mail account. They may not have seen
237 everything but they have seen some.
238

239 D. Bussell commented that her question was not in regards to the ethics of the situation. Clearly, the
240 report was narrowly focused on where the Troyer e-mails had come from. Her question was more
241 pragmatic in nature. She asked T. Ting how she thought this had affected her credibility and ability to
242 function in the office that she obviously cares very deeply about. D. Bussell commented that she knew
243 this must be very difficult for T. Ting, and that there has also been a mixture of opinions within the
244 senate's conference. D. Bussell posited that had the e-mails been sent directly, there may have been some
245 level of support from members of that body. D. Bussell asked T. ting to speak to her thoughts on her
246 credibility, particularly with Pres. Hogan.
247

248 T. Ting replied she believes she still has credibility with Pres. Hogan and the Board of Trustees. She
249 referred to a meeting between the BOT, USC and Pres. Hogan just prior to the release of the investigative
250 report. At that meeting, the Trustees mentioned to the USC that the conference had to be careful about not
251 violating the law. In other words, that they have to understand that there is no communications or
252 meetings that are not open, as long as it does not deal with any personnel matters, litigations, or university
253 acquisitions. She also shared with the USC that in our own Senate statutes, we said that campus Senate
254 governance has to abide by the statutes of the state of Illinois including the open meetings act in

255 conducting University business. There is no such thing as secrecy or coerced confidentiality. T. Ting
256 commented that she doesn't know if all USC members would agree, but one suggestion that the Board
257 chair had is that the USC should have a meeting with the University counsel, Tom Bearrows to go over
258 those kinds of things. T. Ting commented that she felt she could share, because it was not related to
259 personnel matters specifically, that she believes she still has credibility with the president and the Board
260 of Trustees because trustee Kennedy said at the meeting, "There's no secret". In terms of her standing
261 within the USC, within the current members, she does not know. It is very hard. She commented that,
262 "John and I and Carrie, we didn't even know that there was this investigation going on in terms of, you
263 know, the Jones Day, the outside firm, the forensic firm, were brought in to help the ethics officer with
264 his investigation. We didn't know. But just given what has happened up to that point over the break, John
265 Carrie and I, we had it. I know on New Year's Eve, John even sent an e-mail to Carrie and me saying,
266 'I'm going to resign from the University Senates Conference executive committee '. So, based on that e-
267 mail, the three of us have to talk about, that we can't do this anymore because we obviously are no longer
268 effective and in fact, January 10, which is before the report was released, we didn't even know there was
269 such a report at that time and we didn't even know when it was going to be released. But January 10,
270 Carrie and I had a meeting with Chancellor Koch, John would have joined us but he did not because he
271 was in Austin for a meeting, but the three of us had decided we are going to resign from the conference in
272 total. But we wanted to let the Chancellor know first before we resigned because our point was that this is
273 our personal decision but we want the Chancellor to know. Chancellor said she can understand , we don't
274 need her permission, and she appreciates that we give her a heads up and she will support whatever we
275 decide. At that time, we think that if we resign in total, of course we would inform the Senate. But then,
276 the report came out about the anonymous e-mails sent to the University Senates conference on December
277 12 and then all those things exploded. That's it. I have thought about what this investigative report might
278 look like, or maybe specifically made me look like. But I have to tell you I think that some of the words
279 being used are very unfortunate that they actually portray it that way. In fact, I have some problem with it
280 and there's things, more going on that front as well. But I have thought about given the report, given the
281 soundbites from the media, I can understand the senators probably think, 'well I don't know. It may not be
282 best for Tih-Fen to continue to serve as the chair throughout her term', even though my term ends in April
283 and when the senators voted me in again, for the third time last May to chair the Senate, back then I made
284 it very clear to everybody that this will be the last year that I chair the Senate and then after this, I'm done
285 with faculty governance. I made that very clear. But I can understand given all the media, press because
286 guess who's talking out there in the media? Not Carrie, not me, and not John. None of us were talking to
287 the media about this, but look who are talking to media about this entire thing. My point is that you can
288 feel pressure, you can feel uncomfortable, but I will not step down because I think I did something wrong.
289 Because I stand by what I did, I did nothing wrong. You can disagree with me, that's okay. But if you
290 decide it's better to not have to me continue to chair the Senate until my term ends, you want me to step
291 down at this time by voting no-confidence in me, if the majority of you think that, I am at peace with that.
292 I will be glad to step down. But it's not because I step down because I think I did something or as if it
293 indicates I did something wrong.

294
295 A. Sisneros commented that it was his understanding that J. Martin is currently serving as presiding
296 officer and that T. Ting is in the mode of Senator as opposed to the chair. He asked if that was correct.

297
298 J. Martin responded that that was correct.

299
300 An. Sisneros requested that J. Martin not refer to T. Ting as chair.

301
302 J. Martin responded that currently T. Ting is still the chair and that he is the presiding officer.

303
304 An. Sisneros responded, "No she's not, right now she's a Senator".

305

306 J. Martin clarified he is the Vice Chair of the Senate.
307

308 W. Kline commented that he agreed with T. Ting that communication is quite important. He commented
309 that he has not seen the news and has not heard the sound bites. He became aware of the report prior to
310 the SEC meeting last Friday and he waited. W. Kline commented that it has been T. Ting's contention
311 both in her statement and afterward that she has kept the Senate well apprised of what is going on with the
312 USC, that she has kept the Senate on top of things, and that she stands by her actions. She also
313 commented that communication is very important, which he agrees with, and that she has not been the
314 one out there speaking. And yet he would like to know why the SEC, or why she, did not inform the
315 Senate that the report was out there and to take that opportunity to communicate with the Senate about
316 what was going on, even after the SEC had met. The chair has never informed the Senate that this report
317 existed and he would like to know why the Senate was not informed.
318

319 T. Ting replied, "Like I said, there were just a lot of things going on. Part of me, I actually thought, there
320 was the USC meeting, there was the Board of Trustees meeting, and we were also at the cusp, right at the
321 beginning of the semester. I also have to deal with the fact that we don't have any staff members anymore
322 at the office at this time. There are many important things going on right now within the Senate that I
323 have to do all by myself without any support. For example, I have to work on the Grand Marshal
324 elections, the Senate elections, and so forth, get all that stuff in line. Have I thought about trying to send
325 this report to the senators? Well, you're right, perhaps in hindsight, I should just come and talk about, to
326 send an e-mail to all of you saying, 'Hey, this report is out'. But it was never, I never hide that I actually
327 would talk about it. In my report, as a part of my report, at today's meeting, I just did not know and there
328 is no idea or discussion about how we should deal with this. But it was never my intention not to talk
329 about it. Given today's agenda, I have a report as the chair that is where I planned to address this and then
330 would answer any questions if there were questions.
331

332 An. Sisneros had a follow-up question in regards to T. Ting's credibility within the Senates conference.
333 He asked, "How do you feel about whether you have any credibility with us?"
334

335 T. Ting replied, "Well, here's the thing, all I did was for UIS's voice to be heard. I don't think I have
336 violated the trust that I have with UIS. I am not doing this for personal gain. All I did was make sure that
337 people outside of the USC know this dysfunctional dynamic within it and how the minority opinion has
338 been suppressed, and how this pressure has been placed upon us. For example, the enrollment
339 management report where our campus actually supports all 21 recommendations but explicitly expressed
340 concern for one recommendation. Whereas at UIC, their own campus report actually supports all
341 recommendations except for three which are 10,17, and 18, but when it came to the USC report it became,
342 there was only support 43 recommendations. In fact, the entire report was just like the Urbana campus
343 report. It was a very difficult situation where we were pigeonholed into a place where they said, "Hey,
344 this is the framework we can work, we have to have a unified voice otherwise we won't get what we want
345 to get, what we want to have" but in this case the "we" is more for Urbana, not others. Not others. I
346 personally can't take that any more. It's just getting worse and worse because a year and a half ago. Last
347 November when we first introduced, when the board proposed the amendments to the statutes for the
348 administrative streamlining and reorganization, remember?, where we had to create a vice president for
349 research, a vice president for health affairs, we added the VP to the Chancellors' it was already difficult at
350 that time. We already had an uphill battle, it was already difficult at that time, it was so hard to get the
351 minority voice heard. But for that specific amendment, we were actually able to include individual
352 campus opinions as in appendix. According to statute, it says that if an agreement or consensus cannot be
353 achieved then individual campus opinion should be appended as part of the recommendation or of the
354 report coming from the USC. Back then we were able to do that, but it was not easy, already. But over
355 time with more and more initiatives such as the executive director of human resources, executive director
356 of University information technology, and now it's come down to the enrollment management report. The

357 clench is getting harder and harder, what we are told is that we have to have a unified voice, we have to
358 speak with one voice.”

359

360 P. Boltuc commented that he thinks everybody agrees that T. Ting has worked very hard, and she has
361 been under a lot of pressure, and with pressure people make mistakes. P. Boltuc commented that he
362 believes T. Ting has made a very serious mistake and that it is very unfortunate that T. Ting does not
363 recognize it, which, for him, is a major problem.

364

365 D. Bussell asked for clarification. She commented that she has read the investigative report and then she
366 is not getting her information from the media. She has read through the report and the forensic data. She
367 commented that it appears from the report that Pres. Hogan seemed to be aware of the disagreement
368 between the campuses regardless of whatever strategy the USC would be putting in place under the
369 influence of Urbana-Champaign. So it appears from my reading, that Pres. Hogan was aware, that the
370 things that you were trying to accomplish Pres. Hogan was already essentially aware of. She asked, “Is
371 that the case? I am trying to figure out what it is you were trying to accomplish.”

372

373 T. Ting replied, “I couldn't say exactly how he was aware. Of course we talked to him about it. But in the
374 report it specifically mentions that the one e-mail I forwarded to Pres. Hogan regarding what Urbana said,
375 I can read this to you (looks through the investigative report briefly and cannot find it). It was the email
376 that I forwarded, it was a communication to the USC where the Urbana members said something about
377 UIUC and UIC, I mean I'm paraphrasing,”

378

379 D. Bussell commented that she knew which email T. Ting was referring to.

380

381 T. Ting continued, “It could be from there, because that is direct evidence, in writing, someone from
382 Urbana said that and then it refers to UIS as a wildcard.”

383

384 D. Bussell indicated she knew the email to which T. Ting was referring. She commented that in no way
385 did she question the hostility of some members of the USC and in no way did she question that it
386 appeared that they had an emerging strategy and that there was dissent among the campuses on these
387 issues. It appeared though that because T. Ting and other people had been talking directly to Pres. Hogan,
388 that he already was very aware of the conversation about the enrollment plan, he understood directly from
389 T. Ting and not from anonymous e-mails but from other people. He has been out to campuses, he's been
390 talking to people, he understands the differences between the campuses, he's been eliciting that
391 information. D. Bussell questioned why this was necessary since he seemed to be generally aware of the
392 issues.

393

394 T. Ting replied, “But where was the evidence? Or was it just hearsay? It could just be hearsay from us. I
395 don't know. All I'm saying is that when I had a meeting with the campus administration, I told them about
396 this but it could have just been my word. Sometimes I showed them the communications so they can
397 make that judgment on their own. Just like, you remember, the FOIA of the October meeting of the USC
398 because at that meeting, they had discussions specifically about our resolution to restore the rotation of
399 the USC leadership. Certainly John and Carrie can come back and give the Senate the oral report. But we
400 don't want it to be said that we have taken things out of context. That's the reason why we got the tape, so
401 that you can listen, and you can listen yourself about what is being said. You can't imagine the pressure
402 and the difficulty I feel, in response to Peter, I really appreciate your comment. And I do. I just want to
403 say that was the decision that I made at that time. If you asked me, ‘Would I do this again?’ Boy, Would I
404 do this again? (throws hands up)

405

406 A. Sisneros commented, “For example, if I don't trust you, are you asking me and everyone else on the
407 Senate to trust you until the end of semester? I'm confused.”

408
409 T. Ting replied, "If you don't trust me, you can just vote no confidence in me."
410
411 An. Sisneros replied, "No, the point is, let's say you survive the vote, aren't you asking the Senate to trust
412 you until the end of the semester?"
413
414 T. Ting replied, "If the senators vote I will go by the majority. That's it."
415
416 R. Garmil commented that he did not understand why T. Ting felt the need to do this anonymously. It is
417 especially unlikely as T. Ting commented earlier that she had a very good relationship with the
418 president's office and the trustees. And that was something he valued about T. Ting's leadership. At the
419 same time, she commented that she were worried about what the USC would have thought had they found
420 out that T. Ting sent this information. R. Garmil wondered when she was speaking with the people that
421 she worked well with, why didn't she feel free to speak as herself.
422
423 T. Ting replied, "I did. I felt free to speak to it. I had no problem. Despite how I was being treated within
424 the conference, it never stopped me from voicing my opinion or a different view. I did talk to people. But
425 my bottom line is that it would just be my word, so if you saw the e-mail of exactly what was being
426 communicated, you can make the judgment."
427
428 R. Garmil clarified, "I guess what I was saying is couldn't you have sent the same e-mail from your UIS
429 account? Knowing that there was always the opportunity that it would be discovered."
430
431 T. Ting replied, "Like I said because of the tension that a few members of the conference have with Pres.
432 Hogan, from early on we already heard about people wanting to bring forward a no-confidence vote of
433 Pres. Hogan. It is a very difficult and tricky situation. And like I said, I don't know how or when the e-
434 mails would have come to light but I did not want to give any slight opportunity for people to say Pres.
435 Hogan asked me to do that. In fact, he has nothing to do with it; I talked to nobody about my decision."
436
437 T. Helton referred to T. Ting's comments regarding the planned en masse resignation from the USC and
438 asked for clarification regarding whether that had been planned over break or New Years Eve.
439
440 T. Ting clarified that was planned between New Year's Eve and the end of the first week in January. She
441 also clarified that during that same week, she made an appointment with the Chancellor for her and Carrie
442 to discuss the resignation.
443
444 C. Switzer clarified that at the November USC meeting, there was serious discussion about the USC
445 leadership and whether or not it was effective any longer. That was going to be a major topic of the
446 January meeting. So, the decision to resign was going to be based in part on the outcomes of the January
447 meeting. In between that time, the report was released.
448
449 T. Helton asked if there is a plan for the resignation currently.
450
451 T. Ting replied that she will be resigning but is unsure about John and Carrie's decision.
452
453 J. Martin commented that he has let the other members of the USC delegation as well as several other
454 people know that he is ready to get off the USC.
455
456 T. Helton referred to the FOIA request that was made. She asked why a request to the secretary wasn't
457 made instead of a FOIA.
458

459 T. Ting replied, "The fact that our Senate meetings are open meetings, anybody who wants to FOIA the
460 tapes, there should be no question, you should just give the tape over. I was not at the USC meeting in
461 October, John and Carrie went and they had a very difficult time attending that meeting where the USC
462 was discussing our resolution. Within the SEC, we talked about rather than having John or Carrie give the
463 report, let's just get the tape from the USC and then have these senators hear for themselves. Because we
464 were being accused of taking things out of context, then let's get the tape and hear what they said. John
465 actually sent an e-mail to the USC office assistant to ask for the tape, which should not be any problem
466 you should just turn it over. But then it got transmitted to the chair of the USC and then it was discussed
467 in the USC executive committee and the chair and vice chair said that this request had to be brought to the
468 entire membership and brought for a vote. John said, I submit the FOIA. That's how the issue came
469 about."

470

471 An. Sisneros commented, "As I understand, your rationale for acting secretively in a shared governance
472 context was because of the tension. So, my concern is you can't function effectively under pressure. Is
473 that what you're saying?"

474

475 T. Ting replied, "I think that this is your take, that's your category, being secretive. And if you take that
476 as I can't function well under pressure, then that's your opinion. I consider myself to be a highly
477 functioning person, I've been trying to keep things going, keep everything stable."

478

479 An. Sisneros asked, "What did the president ask you to do? I'm confused there."

480

481 T. Ting replied, "The president did not ask me to do anything."

482

483 An. Sineros responded, "You said something to that effect."

484

485 T. Ting said, "No."

486

487 An Sisneros replied, "You might read your statement again."

488

489 T. Ting replied, "The president did not ask me to do anything. Do I have a Mr. Bruce Rushton (sp?) In the
490 audience?"

491

492 J. Martin indicated a point of order and asked Senators to refrain from asking questions of people in the
493 gallery until all senators have had a chance to speak.

494

495 T. Ting continued, "I have the hard copies of statements for anyone who would like to have a copy."

496

497 W. Kline commented that he is concerned about T. Ting's actions. He said, "Your actions and what you
498 do both with the USC and at central administration represent us as faculty. It has been my experience on
499 the Senate that were we to forward any information to the president, votes were taken, permission asked,
500 we were consulted as a body. And yet we have in this instance, both content that was forwarded to the
501 president's office and a manner of forwarding, where you as the head of this deliberative body openly
502 claim that you have unilaterally made these decisions without consulting anybody in this body. Do you
503 think that is an appropriate way for the chair to conduct business of the Senate?"

504

505 T. Ting indicated that she felt that was a very good question. She elaborated, "Certainly when I did that, I
506 did not necessarily think of myself just as the chair of the campus Senate for this campus. I certainly was
507 a member of the USC from the Springfield campus. Here is the thing, the senators can have any
508 communications to the Senators list. Anything that you communicate out there, you should know any
509 senators can feel free to forward to an external body as long as it is not confidential, it does not deal with

510 personnel matters, litigation or university acquisitions. The communications that I forwarded that I
511 received as a member of the USC are not confidential. It still had something to do with the discussions in
512 conducting University business.”

513
514 W. Kline responded that his question did not involve the confidentiality of the emails. He repeated that
515 his point is that T. Ting acted unilaterally without consulting any other members of this deliberative body.
516 He wanted to know if T. Ting felt that was an appropriate way for a chair of this body to conduct business
517 with central administration and the USC, without consulting us?

518 T. Ting replied, “To tell you the truth, at that time, I had not thought about this. I have not thought about
519 to bring it, to have a discussion with the Senate to say this is what I have been up to. In hindsight, should I
520 have done that? (pause). Perhaps maybe. Perhaps maybe you guys would have talked me out of that. I
521 don't know. That was the circumstances and there was this buildup of the difficulties and I just don't see
522 any other alternatives about how to really address and to change the way that USC has been operating.
523 But I want to tell you at that time I did not think about that. I did not think about bringing it to the Senate
524 for discussion. But what I can tell you, what I have been going by has been, for example when we
525 conduct business of the Senate by e-mail, when I send out an e-mail that says senators please give me
526 feedback, never once did I think that any of those e-mails sent by an individual senator to the entire
527 listserv would not get forwarded outside of the senate body because we are conducting University
528 business. That's how, what I was going by at the time. That's what I was thinking at the time. And
529 actually, yes, I did not think about I will have to come to this body to have this discussion with you on
530 that. Because it simply, as I said, when we use e-mail to conduct business for our Senate matters,
531 University/campus matters, and I think anybody could forward that, unless it has something to do with a
532 confidential matter.”

533
534 W. Kline responded, “So you would feel free then forwarding any of the e-mails that we exchange on this
535 Senate to the President's office without consulting us? There would be nothing wrong with that?”

536
537 T. Ting commented, “I'm not saying I would feel free to do everything from that.”

538
539 W. Kline responded, “Well, they're not confidential...”

540
541 T. Ting interjected, “Yes, they're not confidential.”

542
543 W. Kline confirmed, “Yes, they're not confidential, so that would be OK?”

544
545 T. Ting replied. “If they're not confidential, it's about University business, yes that would be okay.”

546
547 W. Kline replied, “Thank you.”

548
549 J. Martin commented he would entertain a motion for a short recess until 11:10 am. A motion to recess
550 was made by L. Fisher and was seconded by S. Miller.

551
552 Following the recess, J. Martin asked Senator Fisher to introduce the motion being brought to the Senate
553 floor.

554
555 L. Fisher introduced the resolution saying, “This resolution emerged following discussions over several
556 days beginning on Monday. Sen. Sisneros wrote the first draft, several of us provided comments, and it
557 was finalized on Thursday morning right before I sent it out to the Senate.” She clarified that direct
558 comments were provided by Prof. Sisneros, Kathryn Eisenhart, Pat Langley, and Lynn Fisher.

559

560 J. Martin entertained a motion to waive reading of the resolution directly into the record since hard copies
561 had been available.

562
563 An. Sisneros objected to not having the resolution read into the record.

564
565 J. Martin invited A. Sisneros to read the resolution into the record.

566
567 T. Ting moved to waive reading the resolution into the record. The motion was seconded by C.
568 Hoelscher.

569
570 The motion was defeated with 9 yes votes, 11 no votes and 3 abstentions (P. Wassenberg, J. Case-Pease,
571 and D. Ruez)

572
573 J. Martin invited one of the authors to read the resolution into the record.

574
575 A. Sisneros read,

576
577 **“Vote of No Confidence; Demand for Resignation of Professor Tih-Fen Ting from the UIS Campus**
578 **Senate and University Senates Conference**

579
580 *Whereas* the University of Illinois Code of Conduct provides in pertinent part: This Code of Conduct
581 establishes guidelines for professional conduct by those acting on behalf of the University including
582 executive officers, faculty, staff, and other individuals employed by the University using University
583 resources or facilities . Those acting on behalf of the University have a general duty to conduct
584 themselves in a manner that will maintain and strengthen the public's trust and confidence in the integrity
585 of the University and take no actions incompatible with their obligations to the University.

586
587 With regard to professional conduct, those acting on behalf of the University should practice: Integrity by
588 maintaining an ongoing dedication to honesty and responsibility; Trustworthiness by acting in a reliable
589 and dependable manner; Compliance by following State and Federal laws and regulations and University
590 policies related to their duties and responsibilities[.]; and

591
592 *Whereas* shared governance also requires integrity, honesty, trustworthiness, and transparency; and

593
594 *Whereas* the *Investigative Report, University of Illinois, Anonymous Emails of December 12, 2011,*
595 *January 13, 2012 Prepared by Jones Day and Duff & Phelps under the direction of*
596 *the University Ethics Office and the Office of University Counsel* found that, in pertinent part:

597
598 Emails from Troyer’s University email account indicate that on September 10, 2011, she began receiving
599 information regarding the USC from a person using the email account uiadvocate@gmail.com. This
600 account identified the individual associated with the account only as “Supporter.” Thirty-six emails from
601 uiadvocate@gmail.com (the “uiadvocate Emails”) were recovered from Troyer’s University email
602 account, most of which forward to Troyer emails containing communications among USC members.
603 Appendix 5. Investigators have determined that USC Member and UIS professor Ting was the person

604 using uiadvocate@gmail.com to send these emails to Troyer as a means of keeping Troyer apprised of
605 USC developments. During an interview with investigators from the University Ethics Office, Ting
606 initially denied that she had sent Troyer the uiadvocate Emails. When further confronted, however, she
607 acknowledged having done so, noting that she did not consider the emails that she had forwarded to be
608 confidential. Ting denied ever speaking with Troyer about the uiadvocate Emails, and stated that and then
609 reiterated she had difficulty believing that Troyer had any involvement about the uiintegrity Emails. Ting
610 added that, even if Troyer had sent the aboutuiintegrity Emails, Hogan would not necessarily have known
611 about them.

612

613 *The source of this of course, you look at this: Investigative Report, University of Illinois, Anonymous*
614 *Emails, pp.9-10; and*

615

616 **Whereas** the actions of Professor Tih-Fen Ting as found in the *Investigative Report, University of Illinois,*
617 *Anonymous Emails* have violated the principles of shared governance and have diminished the standing of
618 the UIS Campus Senate and the influence of UIS with the University Senates Conference;

619

620 **Therefore, be it resolved** that the UIS Campus Senate expresses no confidence in the leadership of
621 Professor Tih-Fen Ting, Chair of the UIS Campus Senate, and condemns her unethical and unprofessional
622 conduct both prior to and during the *Anonymous Email Investigation*; and

623 **Be it further resolved** that it is the will of the UIS Campus Senate that Professor Tih-Fen Ting
624 immediately resign from the positions of Chair of the Campus Senate, Senator-at-Large, and member of
625 the University Senates Conference; and

626

627 **Be it further resolved** that this Resolution of a Vote of No Confidence in Professor Tih-Fen Ting be
628 forwarded to the Chairs of the Campus Senates at UIC and UIUC, the University Senates Conference,
629 President Michael Hogan, the members of the University Of Illinois Board Of Trustees.”

630

631 A motion for discussion of the first reading was made by L. Fisher and was seconded by T. Helton.

632

633 R. Garmil made a friendly amendment to include Chancellor Koch to line 619. The friendly amendment
634 was accepted.

635

636 L. Fisher commented, “I'd like to comment briefly on the goals of this resolution. As Prof. Ting stated
637 very clearly, Tony and I went to her office on Tuesday afternoon after he had drafted the very first draft
638 of the motion but before it had been developed fully or shared with others. We did ask Prof. Ting to step
639 down stating as our reason that we thought that her actions would have shaken confidence in the Senate
640 leadership, in shared governance on the campus, and especially would have damaged our working
641 relationships with the other senates and especially our colleagues on the other campuses. As she said, she
642 said she did not want to step down voluntarily from those roles but that she would if there was a vote of
643 no confidence. Goal number one is to find out the will of the Senate on this matter, to give the Senate a
644 chance to vote on that. The second goal of this resolution is to communicate, is to take the first step in
645 beginning to repair those working relationships with other shared governance bodies in the University of
646 Illinois by affirming our strong belief in and value for the principles of transparency and honesty in
647 shared governance, and our adherence to the University of Illinois code of conduct. So that's the second

648 goal, is to give the Senate a chance to simply affirm its high value for integrity and transparency in shared
649 governance and our intent to work towards repairing those working relationships and working in a
650 collegial manner with our colleagues on the other campuses.”

651

652 T. Helton asked a question she wished to pose, although she indicated there may not be anyone who can
653 answer. The question, open to all, was in regards to the extent to which our credibility may have been
654 damaged.

655

656 L. Fisher responded that the assertion made in line 58 of the resolution is just that, an assertion. She
657 expounded, “That is based on the assumption that the Senate will judge that using anonymous e-mails in
658 the conduct of our official business in shared governance at the U of I is in fact not appropriate behavior
659 and not conducive to establishing the trust required for effective shared governance.”

660

661 D. Schuldt indicated, “There are motions that are going to be made that I have become aware of to the
662 senates of the other two campuses, but they do relate to the Troyer issue and not our specific issue
663 although this would be involved with that.”

664

665 L. Fisher added, “In general the basis of this assertion is, (pause) as I became aware of the report which is
666 when it was forwarded to me by another senator last Friday afternoon, at that point news was coming out
667 about the investigation. And it was clear, the report clearly states that anonymous e-mails are not
668 appropriate behavior for a few U of I employees in the course of their professional duties. Because of that,
669 my feeling that the report, and as we know president Hogan then came out to apologize for the ethical
670 lapse in his office, and I understand that the exact facts of who did what with regard to the anonymous e-
671 mails sent from Troyer's computer that there is still some debate about who sent those e-mails. It is clear
672 that the e-mails themselves, if they came from an University of Illinois employee, were regarded as an
673 ethical lapse and president Hogan condemned that and apologized for that that scandal and
674 embarrassment to the University had come out of his office. He took responsibility for it and he also took
675 the report at face value. Based on that alone, I think it is incumbent upon our Senate to do something
676 about this. I understand how difficult and painful this kind of proceeding is; however, the question I keep
677 asking myself is, what does it say about our Senate and our sense of how shared governance operates if
678 we say nothing about an established case of using anonymous e-mails and Senates Conference in shared
679 governance business. That is where the sense of damage comes from. We are dealing with a case that has
680 been identified as an embarrassment to the University of Illinois in terms of just that dynamic, sending
681 anonymous e-mail in the course of conducting University business, if that is what happened in that other
682 case. Here we have it and I think we have to respond or we appear to condone as a Senate the practice of
683 sending anonymous e-mails without notification, forwarding the communications of a body.”

684

685 T. Ting responded, “I want to respond to that, I think there's some confusion here. When President Hogan
686 said that he took their report at face value, it was the fact that the report concluded that it is very
687 reasonable to infer that Lisa Troyer acted alone in sending those two anonymous e-mails to the USC. It is
688 true that in the beginning of the report there was a line about (searching through the report) the policy
689 part, I can't find it now but basically it's where it refers to not using the anonymous e-mails, but that was
690 specifically UIUC policy, that was not the policy for the entire U of I. I also want to remind senators, if
691 the, here's the thing, this is the question we can ask the president and also Dr. Lisa Troyer as well, we can
692 ask them if they have ever received any anonymous e-mails or confidential meetings requests from within
693 the University. The point I want to make is if that anonymous are such a rare occasion, if anonymous e-
694 mails are so unacceptable, then why would president Hogan, which is addressed in the report, president
695 Hogan then communicated with Chairman Kennedy and then actually appended that anonymous e-mail
696 that he received. I just want to put that in the open for the Senators to think about.”

697

698 D. Bussell posed a question in terms of the credibility issue and possible damage for us as a campus, in
699 terms of what the scope of the Senate Chair's focus is, should it be on protecting the President of the
700 University or speaking for the campus? This is a question she has heard coming from our constituency. A
701 second question posed by D. Bussell was in regards to the public. She commented that she opened up the
702 *Illinois Times* yesterday to see an article which included a picture of T. Ting next to L. Troyer. The article
703 recounted events in a less than sympathetic view and it is a bit of a public embarrassment. D. Bussell
704 asked, in terms of our public image, the photo gives an impression of UIS at a time when we are
705 struggling to define ourselves still for that larger community. In summary, she raised two questions,
706 "What are our responsibilities to our faculty and to the public?"

707
708 A. Sisneros commented that he was even more concerned now than he was before since T. Ting said she
709 would do it again.

710
711 T. Ting replied, "No."

712
713 An. Sisneros responded, "Yes, in response to Sen. Cline you said you would do it again, did you not? He
714 asked you, 'Are you Ok with sending anonymous emails given our own discussions here in our senate.'"

715
716 T. Ting replied, "No, that's not what I said."

717
718 J. Martin indicated that if we referred back to the record, it would indicate there was a hand gesture.

719
720 T. Ting clarified, "No, I did not say I would do that again with the anonymous email."

721
722 An. Sisneros indicated, "Oh, I misunderstood you."

723
724 T. Ting continued, "I simply said that any communication within the Senate, conducting business, as long
725 as it's not confidential I would never expect that it would not be shared with the bodies outside of the
726 Senate. I did not say I would do it again, forwarding anonymous e-mails."

727
728 An. Sisneros responded, "Initially the president was quoted in the press as saying relative to the Chief of
729 Staff and that behavior, as a lapse in judgment. The press also reported the chair of the Board of Trustees
730 as referring to it as, 'juvenile behavior'. So we have a dilemma here. You are associated with that
731 exchange with the chief, and if the chief is being articulated in those terms, do you feel that you acted
732 similarly?"

733
734 T. Ting explained, "Let me say it again, that anonymous e-mail on December 12, 2011 was sent to the
735 entire University Senates Conference membership. The e-mails that I forwarded to Lisa Troyer with the
736 anonymous e-mail account was just to her, period. If there is such a problem with not accepting
737 anonymous e-mails then they can just simply ignore that. But the fact that, in the report, it shows that
738 President Hogan brought it to chairman Kennedy's attention about what was going on within the USC
739 with the anonymous message, the email that I forwarded was an anonymous email account. So what does
740 that mean?"

741
742 P. Boltuc commented that he was not concerned about public perception or public embarrassment. He
743 does care about proper ways to do business and he thinks this is a little bit of a problem here- he thinks
744 there's more than one way to do things and that the Senate is much less involved. Some may not fully
745 understand the pressures under which Tih-Fen has been operating for a long time. However, leadership
746 requires one to find the proper answers. In general, he does not think Tih-Fen acts badly under pressure.
747 He has seen her and has much respect for how she has acted in many situations. However, he believes
748 sending the anonymous emails was the wrong decision and he does not think the Senate should spend

749 much time talking about the background and other things. He indicated that this is the kind of decision in
750 which a dignified politician should resign. Since Tih-Fen has not resigned, in terms of the dignity of this
751 body it is the Senate's responsibility to ask her to resign. He believes continuing the discussion beyond a
752 certain point makes sense.

753
754 Prof. Transue commented in response to Sen. Helton's question regarding evidence of damage to the UIS
755 reputation. He referred to a proposal for action at the UIUC senate dated 12.1.0, Statement on ethical
756 leadership and shared Senate executive governance. In its appendices, there is a line which reads, "the
757 investigative report shows that before the president received these documents, USC member Tih-Fen Ting
758 leaked them to the president's Chief of Staff." Prof. Transue commented that he took the word "leak" as a
759 negative, having negative connotation. He further commented that UIUC Senate may reject this as it is
760 only a proposal. He agrees that there is quite a bit of evidence to show that Tih-Fen was mistreated by
761 people from UIUC. He felt that this was some evidence.

762
763 Kent Redfield, Prof. Emeritus of political science, commented that he had to terms on the UIS Senate
764 including three years of service on the SEC. He agreed that the external perception is not the most
765 important issue. However, he works with senior faculty on the UIC and UIUC campuses and it is clear
766 there is going to be a negative reaction to the actions that the UIS Senate chair. Those actions are viewed
767 as unethical and there seems to be question as to what is occurring at UIS. Ultimately, it is his opinion
768 that the chair's behavior was reckless and ultimately stupid because there are people on the UIUC who
769 are not happy about sharing the University of Illinois name with Chicago, let alone Springfield. Now, in
770 his opinion, they are going to say, 'See, we can't trust them, they are not up to it, look how they behaved.'
771 So this is going to do tremendous damage in terms of us going forward with our relationship with the
772 other two campuses because of the behavior that was undertaken. The damage is already there and it's a
773 matter of now undoing it, it isn't something that's going to happen. It's already happened.

774
775 L. Fisher agreed that the public perception is less important than our own reflections on what constitutes
776 the job of the Senate chair. She wished to return to T. Ting's earlier remarks in which she asked if the use
777 of anonymous e-mails was so problematic, why the president used them in his own e-mails. She recalled
778 that T. Ting concluded with the question, "What does that mean?" She asked T. Ting to address that.

779
780 T. Ting responded, "I only said, if you read the report, I think that there was, that President Hogan wrote
781 to chairman Kennedy bringing to his attention about that e-mail. But that e-mail was from the anonymous
782 e-mail account and he actually attached the anonymous e-mail and said, 'I received this anonymous e-
783 mail about what's going on within the USC on the enrollment management report.' My point is, if
784 anonymous e-mails are so problematic in the first place, why would President Hogan even take on with
785 that, why would he actually attach it to let chairman Kennedy see exactly what was being said about the
786 whole discussion on enrollment management."

787
788 L. Fisher clarified that she mixed up whether it was going to the USC or the Chair of the Board, but either
789 way, that statement, 'if it was so bad why did he use it' is exactly the issue L. Fisher wanted to get out.
790 She reiterated that T. Ting posed the question, "What does that mean?", and that she would like to know
791 from T. Ting what that meant. L. Fisher referred to her own comment regarding anonymous e-mails not
792 being regarded as appropriate professional communications for University employees. L. Fisher reminded
793 T. Ting that she (T. Ting) indicated that that actually came out of the UIUC IT appropriate use policy, but
794 L. Fisher asked, "Does that mean that you think anonymous e-mails are okay?"

795
796 T. Ting replied, "you know, I don't know what else I have to say to you. I think I gave my reasons about
797 why I chose to use anonymous e-mails at that point. Whether you agree with my actions are not, those
798 were my reasons at that time. Now you asked me, 'will you do this again Tih-Fen in the future?' My
799 answer would be, 'No'.

800
801 L. Fisher asked, "Why?"
802
803 T. Ting continued, "Why? Well, look at what happened."
804
805 (laughter)
806
807 T. Ting continued, "Look at what happened. And I have to say I certainly had no idea that it would
808 become such as this, but I had my reasons why I chose anonymous e-mails at that point. After all that
809 time, after all those difficulties and problems, but I certainly think things exploded. And I somehow, even
810 though the investigative report had nothing to do with the anonymous e-mails that I used, it was
811 specifically about the two anonymous e-mails sent to the entire USC membership. But obviously
812 somehow it has become, one of the focal points or talk and it certainly has brought concern to you all.
813 And seeing this reaction, you asked me if I would do it again. I would say no, under no circumstance
814 would I do it again. But it was a decision that I made at that time and with the reasons that I gave, why I
815 chose to do that."
816
817 J. Martin interjected indicating there was 10 minutes remaining in the scheduled meeting. He requested
818 that the current topic be concluded in order to move on to the competing motion and an additional first
819 reading from the regular agenda.
820
821 R. Garmil moved to extend the meeting until 1 p.m. The motion did not receive a second.
822
823 An. Sisneros commented, "Tih-Fen you said, 'Look what happened, I wouldn't do it again.' If this didn't
824 happen, would you do it again?"
825
826 T. Ting replied, "What?"
827
828 An. Sisneros continued, "You said you wouldn't do this behavior again because look what happened. So,
829 if it hadn't happened, which you continue to do that? If that's your criteria..."
830
831 T. Ting responded, "Here's the thing. I will have resigned from the USC so there's nothing for me to
832 forward."
833
834 L. Fisher reminded the Senate of the motion that was voted on when she first moved to amend the agenda.
835 She continued, "I said adding resolution 41-28 as the first order of business and that final vote by written
836 ballot be taken on it at this meeting. That was the motion that we voted on."
837
838 J. Martin responded, "My understanding is that there are procedural things we have to go through in order
839 to do that, voting on it for the agenda does not in itself enact that statement."
840
841 C. Switzer clarified that it does. She continued, "Normally in our bylaws we like to have a second reading
842 but in this case we can agree by a simple majority by accepting the first sentence in the motion that we are
843 going to accept this motion on its first reading."
844
845 J. Martin indicated that he accepted the interpretation from the parliamentarian and as a point of privilege
846 indicated he would have preferred this to occur under rule seven but he will obey rule six. He asked for
847 further comments.
848
849 T. Ting commented, "In my statement, I mentioned that I have no problem making a motion, as the
850 Senate chair I need to gauge the level of support that I have on the Senate. I know that I will not be

851 elected if I don't have the support from the majority of Senators. I have no problem making the motion,
852 my own motion, as the Senate chair to have the Senators to vote confidence or no confidence in me. I
853 have no problem to make that motion myself as the Senate chair. However, I have a problem with this
854 specific resolution that was brought by Senators Lynn Fisher and Tony Sisneros. I mean at least that you
855 guys are Senators and endorsed this resolution and actually worked with faculty members who are not on
856 the Senate. I feel that this resolution when it was drafted was based on only one source, which is the
857 investigative report. It was not done with fact checking or due process, in my view. Essentially this
858 resolution is calling for a censure of me. If you are calling of a censure of me I would like to have due
859 process. But I don't feel that that process was given first before this resolution was sent. So here's the
860 thing, my motion will achieve the same goal as you want to achieve, if the majority of the senators vote
861 no confidence in me. I will respectfully ask you to withdraw your resolution and have me have my motion
862 because I have strong objections over the resolution you brought forward and endorsed on procedural
863 grounds.”

864
865 L. Fisher clarified, “So you are asking us to withdraw this motion. I would decline to withdraw.”

866
867 A. Sisneros added, “Me as well.”

868
869 J. Martin asked if there were any further motions or amendments.

870
871 C. Hoelscher asked if it would be possible to vote on both motions.

872
873 J. Martin indicated the according to order of the agenda, we pass to the next competing motion. It would
874 be a matter of amending the agenda to not go to the next one. He clarified that it is normal in Roberts
875 Rules of Order to have these types of motions be conducted by a secret ballot which he endorsed because
876 the presiding officer is then allowed to vote.

877
878 L. Fisher called for a point of order indicating that Prof. Ting made a comment in regards to the lack of
879 due process. She wanted to point out that we have followed the parliamentary procedures that are guided
880 by Roberts Rules of Order and that we have followed the procedure for the censure of the president of the
881 body. It does not require a hearing and that's because what we're doing here is simply a statement of the
882 will of the Senate, it is not a legally binding, it is not, for example, an expulsion from the body. In this
883 case, it is a demand to resign. An expulsion, under the same set of rules does require a formal hearing but
884 that's because it has that legally binding result of actually removing a member from the body. The
885 procedures were actually discussed with the parliamentarian prior to deciding to proceed in the way they
886 did.

887
888 J. Martin asked if a motion was needed in regards to the way in which the vote is conducted.

889
890 C. Switzer replied, “In the motion that we accepted the final vote by written ballot be taken.”

891
892 J. Martin asked for any additional questions comments or motions.

893
894 T. Ting commented, “I just want to make sure that, so you make it very clear that this is not legally
895 binding. In fact there is no such a motion of so-called vote of no-confidence in Roberts's Rules. And so,
896 this is how you express your wish but it cannot bind, it cannot force me to resign as the Senate chair. But
897 what I want to say is that I would like to see this motion withdrawn, and to put my motion, my own
898 motion as the Senate chair in trying to gauge the level of Senate support, if the majority of the senators
899 voted no confidence in me then I will resign from the Senate. So those are two very different things. In
900 other words you'll have two different outcomes here. If you vote on this motion, this motion sponsored by
901 Prof. Sisneros and by Prof. Lynn Fisher, if it got past it does not mean that I will resign as the Senate

902 chair. However, if you vote on my motion, that will have two vote confidence or no confidence in me. If
903 the majority of you say you have no confidence, I will resign as the Senate chair, I will resign from the
904 campus Senate and from the University senates conference.”

905
906 R. Garmil moved to extend the meeting 15 minutes and the motion was seconded by D. Schuldt. The
907 motion passed 0 no votes and 1 abstention (D. Ruez).

908
909 L. Fisher commented, “All I'll say is, just to explain why I'm declining to withdraw the motion, as I said
910 in the beginning I think this motion was designed, this resolution was designed to achieve two goals. One
911 was the request for the resignation, which chair Ting said she would comply with if the majority of the
912 Senate had no confidence in her.”

913
914 T. Ting interjected, “Not if you vote on this resolution.”

915
916 L. Fisher replied, “You are saying that now, but you didn't say that earlier. And the second goal was
917 simply to state something about the expectations that we have for the transparent conduct of shared
918 governance. So that's the choice.”

919
920 P. Boltuc referred to T. Ting’s comments stating that she would not resign under the resolution brought
921 forth by Senators Sisneros and Fisher, but that she would if a majority of senators voted no confidence
922 under her resolution. He commented, “I think we shouldn't be treated by the chair in a certain way which
923 kind of forces us to choose her way. I wasn't sure if I was going to vote one way or the other, but now I
924 will vote by secret ballot to support it because I think that your last political move is completely
925 unacceptable and manipulative.”

926
927 J. Martin called for final comments. Seeing none, blank ballots were distributed by L. Fisher and were
928 collected by the Secretary. The votes were tabulated by K. Sheridan and R. Garmil.

929
930 The motion passed with 16 yes votes, 5 no votes, and 7 abstentions (P. Wassenberg, D. Ruez, J. Tienken,
931 E. Wilson, Y. Zhang, C. Hoelscher and D. Miller).

932
933 A. Sisneros commented that it was necessary for J. Martin to make a statement, as indicated by Roberts
934 Rules.

935
936 Upon review of a written statement handed to J. Martin, he indicated that he did not recognize the
937 statement.

938
939 An. Sisneros commented, “For the record, I want the record to show, that my understanding of procedure
940 is that you are required to make the following statement, ‘Mdm. Chair, the UIS campus Senate has voted
941 no confidence in you and demands your immediate resignation for the reasons contained in the resolution.
942 What is your response?’”

943
944 J. Martin responded that he does not recognize the statement because a statement of no confidence is not
945 part of Robert’s Rules which are not part of our operating rules.

946
947 An. Sisneros requested that this be part of the record.

948
949 J. Martin moved to the next motion, a motion of no confidence in the chair. He requested an introduction
950 to the motion from T. Ting.

951

952 T. Ting replied, “I was going to introduce my own motion to gauge the level of Senate support, to see
953 whether the majority of you still have confidence in me to let me finish my term. But given how the vote
954 turned out, in response to this resolution as sponsored by Sen. Fisher and Tony Sisneros, even though I
955 remained having strong objections over it on its procedural grounds, I feel that I have not been given due
956 process for this resolution to arise. But, in any event, I think it was very clear to me that the majority of
957 senators have showed me that you have no confidence in me. That would be 15 out off out 28, 15 voted
958 yes on this resolution sponsored by Sen. Fisher and Sen. Tony Sisneros so that's the majority vote. As a
959 result, I will resign from the UIS campus Senate and USC effective immediately. I will withdraw my
960 motion because there is no point anymore. I was hoping that I wouldn't have to.”

961
962 J. Martin asked for any objections to withdrawing the motion. Hearing none, he directed the Senators
963 attention to a first reading of Resolution 41-27 .

964
965 **New Business**

966
967 **Resolution 41-27 Rename the Department of Visual Arts to the Department of Art, Music, and**
968 **Theatre [1st reading]**

969 A motion to consider Resolution 41-27 was made by D. Ballard and was seconded by T. Helton.
970

971 P. Wassenberg explained that this seemed to be a non-controversial issue with wide support among the
972 departments. She asked if there were any known issues or concerns regarding the name change. If none,
973 she suggested waiver of the first reading might occur for this particular resolution.

974
975 No issues or concerns were brought forth in the discussion.

976
977 P. Wassenberg brought forth a motion to suspend the rules and the motion was seconded by D. Bussell.
978 The motion was non-debatable. The motion to suspend the rules passed unanimously.

979
980 No discussion or comments were brought forth for the 2nd reading and J. Martin moved to a vote on
981 Resolution 41-28. The resolution carried unanimously.

982
983 **Adjournment**

984
985 A motion to adjourn was made by T. Helton and was seconded by R. Garmil. The motion carried with
986 unanimous support and the meeting was adjourned at 12:17 p.m.