

From: About UIIntegrity [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

From: About UIIntegrity [aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com]

Sent: Monday, December 12, 2011 8:18 PM

To: Burbules, Nicholas C; Graber, Kim C

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

Subject: Re: call for reason and honesty

Colleagues,

For two who urge that none respond, but privilege themselves to do so is further disturbing; and it is disturbing to find it comes from two who stood up at our senate meeting last week and issued veiled threats toward other colleagues among us:

<http://ensemble.atlas.uiuc.edu/app/sites/XMdT6pH9p0aodEYI4PZMEg.aspx>

Perhaps if the intimidation by some of others, actively and passively as demonstrated in these responses and as occurs with growing regularity at our meetings, had not become endemic, steps such as anonymity and silence would not have become necessary. I can't help noticing that fewer and fewer senators participate in discussions. Silence is its own form of anonymity.

More troubling than anonymity and silence (which I agree are unfortunate, but have become necessary for some of us) are threats and degradation of colleagues used to coerce the presentation of a false consensus. The threatening behavior has already become public, as the video of the meeting reveals, and I agree it is shameful.

I find it disappointing, but not surprising, that some shirk a debate over the validity and integrity of conveying a false consensus on the part of the senate and the campuses we represent.

Senator