



INVESTIGATIVE REPORT

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
ANONYMOUS EMAILS OF DECEMBER 12, 2011

JANUARY 13, 2012

*Prepared by Jones Day and Duff & Phelps under the direction of
the University Ethics Office and the Office of University Counsel.*

JONES
DAY®

DUFF & PHELPS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Incident Summary	Page 3
Investigation Commenced	Page 4
Investigative Steps	Page 5
Forensic/Network Analysis	Page 5
Document Review	Page 5
Interviews	Page 5
Summary of Principal Findings	Page 6
Forensic Analysis	Page 7
Applicable Policies	Page 8
Factual Chronology	Page 9
Fall 2011	Page 9
December 5, 2011	Page 10
December 9-11, 2011	Page 16
December 12, 2011	Page 18
Physical Security of the Troyer Laptop	Page 24
Hacking Analysis	Page 25
Interview with Hogan	Page 27
Findings & Conclusions	Page 28

Incident Summary

On December 12, 2011, two anonymous emails were sent to 20 members of the University of Illinois Senates Conference (“USC”). Both emails were identified within the text as having been written by an unnamed Senator, and the address from which the emails were sent, aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com, did not identify a specific individual as the sender.

The first email was sent at 11:56 am¹ (the “First Anonymous Email”) and, among other things, stated that the President of the University had received a confidential USC committee report relating to a President-supported enrollment management proposal “from an outside source”; urged the recipients of the email not to “[p]retend[] consensus exists” among the University’s three campuses with respect to this proposal, but rather, to be “transparent and honest” in acknowledging the differences of opinion among the campuses and to issue separate campus reports (rather than a single, collective report) “in the interest of integrity and transparency”; and emphasized that “[t]here is strength in honesty; there is weakness in dishonesty.” Appendix (“App.”) 1.² The First Anonymous Email was signed “Senator,” thereby leaving the impression that the email was authored by a USC member. This purported USC Senator explained his/her desire to remain anonymous as follows: “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.” App. 1.

At 8:18 pm, a second anonymous email (the “Second Anonymous Email”) was sent from the aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com email account. App. 2. This message replied to responses to the First Anonymous Email; in these responses, certain USC members had objected to the anonymous nature of that email. The sender of the Second Anonymous Email reiterated his/her reason for remaining anonymous (i.e., alleged “intimidation” by certain USC members) and likewise alleged that “threats and degradation of colleagues [had been] used to coerce the presentation of a false consensus” with respect to the enrollment management proposal. This email was also signed “Senator.”

One of the recipients of these anonymous emails (collectively, the “aboutuiintegrity Emails”), Roy Campbell, a USC member and computer science professor at the Urbana-Champaign campus (“UIUC”), identified data embedded in the First Anonymous Email suggesting that it had been created on a computer that included a user account named “troyer.” At the time, Lisa Troyer was the Chief of Staff to the University President.

Specifically, Campbell noted the following filepath:

¹ All times noted in this report are in Central Standard Time.

² Accompanying this report is an Appendix containing documents cited to herein and work papers related to the forensic analysis conducted by Duff & Phelps.

file://localhost/Users/troyer/Library/Cache=s/TemporaryItems/msoclip/0clip_filelist.xml.³

Campbell shared his finding with the sender and all recipients of the aboutuiintegrity Emails in an email that he sent at 8:26 pm on December 12 (i.e., eight minutes after the Second Anonymous Email) (the “Campbell Email”). App. 3. In his email, which included the First Anonymous Email and a response thereto, Campbell cautioned against assuming the identity of the sender or assigning “any blame about the anonymous email” based on his finding, noting that this “email can so easily be faked or copied from another document.” App. 3.

At 8:27 pm on December 12, Tih-Fen Ting, a USC member and professor at the Springfield campus (“UIS”) who had received the aboutuiintegrity Emails and the Campbell Email, called Troyer. Ting and Troyer spoke until approximately 8:38 pm. At 8:43 pm, Ting, using the email account uiadvocate@gmail.com and without otherwise identifying herself, forwarded the Campbell Email to Troyer at Troyer’s University email account. At 8:44 pm, Troyer called Ting, and they spoke until 8:48 pm.

At 8:50 pm, Troyer sent an email to Michael Hites (the University’s Executive CIO and Associate Vice President, Administrative Information Technology Services (AITS)), expressing concern that her laptop computer (the “Troyer Laptop”) had been hacked. App. 4.

At 8:56 pm, Troyer called University President Michael Hogan. This conversation lasted approximately 14 minutes. Later in the evening of December 12, Troyer spoke by telephone with Hites five times, with Hogan two more times, and with Ting three more times.

Investigation Commenced

The University IT Department promptly commenced an investigation of this incident, initially focusing on whether the Troyer Laptop, an Apple MacBook issued by the University, had been hacked. Troyer subsequently reported this incident to the University Ethics Office, which then consulted with the IT Department and assumed control of the investigation. In statements to IT and Ethics Office personnel, Troyer denied sending the aboutuiintegrity Emails and asserted that her computer must have been hacked by a third party who sent these emails remotely from her computer.

Hogan notified Chris Kennedy, the University Board Chair, of the incident, and thereafter, in consultation with the Ethics Office and University Counsel, approved the retention of outside firms to assist in the investigation. On December 22, 2011,

³ The user account “localhost/Users/troyer” is the user account for Lisa Troyer on her MacBook laptop.

the University engaged Jones Day for this purpose; Jones Day, in turn, engaged Duff & Phelps to conduct an independent forensic analysis of the Troyer Laptop and related forensic data, and to determine the source of the aboutuiintegrity Emails and whether the Troyer Laptop showed any evidence of having been improperly accessed by a third-party.⁴

Investigative Steps

Forensic / Network Analyses

In connection with its investigation, the University IT Department conducted an extensive review of the University network and physical security, and of the Troyer Laptop. The security analysis included malware scans and a review of file sharing, remote access tools and firewall activity. Duff & Phelps thereafter reviewed and validated the IT Department's security and laptop analyses, and conducted an independent forensic analysis of the Troyer Laptop, along with an intrusion review, in an attempt to "break through" the firewall and other safety protocols of the computer.

Document Review

Jones Day lawyers reviewed every email and related attachments found in Troyer's University email account from December 1, 2011, through December 19, 2011 – a total of over 3,500 emails. With respect to emails in this account from September through November 2011, Jones Day lawyers ran targeted, key-word searches of Troyer's University-account emails, using various search terms, including: "enrollment manage" (which would also capture "enrollment management" and "enrollment manager"), "senate," "SEC," "USC," "anonymous," "Tih-Fen," "Switzer," "Ghosh," "Goillini," "Aboutuiintegrity," and "Uiadvocate." Jones Day lawyers reviewed those documents in which one or more of these search terms appeared (approximately 1500 total) and also reviewed all emails collected from Troyer's personal Gmail account (105 total), which Troyer voluntarily supplied to investigators at their request. Troyer also voluntarily provided records of calls to and from her cellular telephone in December 2011; these records were also reviewed by investigators.

Interviews

Investigators from Jones Day, Duff & Phelps, and/or the University Ethics Office conducted interviews of the following individuals with relevant knowledge:

⁴ Duff & Phelps did not independently confirm the findings of the University IT department relating to the physical security of the laptop.

-
- Christophe Pierre, Vice President for Academic Affairs (December 19, 2011, and January 7, 2012)
 - Lisa Troyer (December 20, 2011, January 6, 2012*, and January 12, 2012)
 - Phyllis Wise, V.P./Chancellor UIUC Campus (January 8, 2012)
 - Tih-Fen Ting, USC Member and UIS Faculty (January 9, 2012)
 - Michael Hogan, University President (January 10, 2012)
 - Carrie Switzer, USC Member and UIS Faculty (January 10, 2012)

* On January 6, 2012, Hogan announced that Troyer had resigned her post as Executive Assistant to the President / Chief of Staff.

Summary of Principal Findings

The investigative record supports the following findings and conclusions:

- The Troyer Laptop was used to compose the content of the aboutuiintegrity Emails and then to send these emails.
- Troyer was in possession of the Troyer Laptop at the time the aboutuiintegrity Emails were sent.
- The Troyer Laptop was not improperly accessed by any third-party, either directly or remotely, at any relevant time. Indeed, the investigation uncovered no evidence to indicate that the Troyer Laptop had been improperly accessed at any time.
- The investigation uncovered no evidence of any breach of University network security with respect to the Troyer Laptop.
- Given the above findings, and the additional information developed in this investigation described below, it is reasonable to infer that Troyer composed and sent the aboutuiintegrity Emails, using her laptop and falsely representing herself to be a University Senator.
- On December 5, 2011 (a week before sending the aboutuiintegrity Emails), Troyer used the Troyer Laptop to open a separate Yahoo! email account (goillini81@yahoo.com); to compose anonymous emails (the “goillini81 Emails”), purportedly from a “Soon ex-senator,” that were critical of comments made by certain Senators in opposition to the enrollment management proposal; and to send the goillini81 Emails as a “test” to Troyer’s University email account. These emails appear not to have been sent to any other person.

The investigative record does not support the conclusion that, prior to this investigation, any other person knew that Troyer intended to send, or had sent, the aboutuiintegrity Emails, or that she had drafted the goillini81 Emails.

Forensic Analysis

The Troyer Laptop is a university-owned Apple MacBook Air, model number A1304, serial number W89441099A7, with the operating system OSX 10.6.8. This computer was secured by the University IT Department on December 13, 2011, and a forensic image of its hard drive was captured. Duff & Phelps reviewed this image using EnCase computer forensic software.

Duff & Phelps analyzed the forensic image for data regarding web activity.

The Internet browser installed on the Troyer Laptop is Mozilla Firefox version 3.6.7. By default, Firefox archives a history of the URLs of pages visited by the user, along with other metadata. The Internet history from Troyer's Firefox web browser was not available for review because the browser was set to not save its history. It is unclear when this setting was enabled.

In the absence of Internet history logs, Duff & Phelps examined Internet cookies and Firefox session data on the Troyer Laptop to identify information about the documented internet usage of the computer in the time period under review. Internet browsers such as Firefox keep track of "session data" in order to restore a user's open windows and tabs in the event of a crash. Review of such session data can be used to recreate some information regarding a user's recent Internet history.

In addition, a search for any browser history records that may have been deleted was conducted.⁵ These searches yielded 86 Firefox session data files that contained references to the Yahoo! email accounts [aboutuiintegrity](#) or [goillini81](#), some of which had already been located by the University IT Department. These searches, however, did not identify any deleted browser history records, which indicates that Firefox may never have been set to archive its history.

The forensic image was also analyzed for any evidence of malicious software activity. This included scanning the image using antivirus software, reviewing system logs contained on the drive for any unusual activity, a review of deleted log entries located by the University IT Department and a review of files accessed starting on December 5, 2011, through the time the drive was acquired by the University IT Department.

Additionally, the forensic image was booted in a controlled environment in order to verify that the system's firewall was functioning normally. This scan identified no services running on the system that were periodically sending data to

⁵ When files are deleted from a user's computer, the operating system no longer recognizes the file and the space where the file resides is made available for overwriting; this condition is referred to as unallocated space. Until the file is overwritten by subsequent data, it may be recovered from unallocated space by the use of forensic tools.

unidentified systems. Information from this analysis was compared to data provided by the University IT Department to confirm that the activity found on the network security systems was consistent with activity found on the Troyer Laptop.

The forensic image was also reviewed in order to confirm findings reported by the University IT Department regarding the usage of the Disk Utility and the recovery of data from Microsoft Word.

Duff & Phelps also reviewed information stored in Troyer's Microsoft Outlook account, including her email folders. This information is stored by Outlook in a data storage file called the Personal Information Store File (the ".pst file").

Duff & Phelps also acquired the Troyer Laptop in order to conduct a live system analysis to search for any otherwise unseen vulnerabilities or possible compromises that would manifest themselves while the operating system was allowed to run in real time.

Applicable Policies

Code of Conduct

The University's Code of Conduct provides in pertinent part as follows:

This Code of Conduct establishes guidelines for professional conduct by those acting on behalf of the University including executive officers, faculty, staff, and other individuals employed by the University using University resources or facilities

Those acting on behalf of the University have a general duty to conduct themselves in a manner that will maintain and strengthen the public's trust and confidence in the integrity of the University and take no actions incompatible with their obligations to the University.

With regard to professional conduct, those acting on behalf of the University should practice:

- * Integrity by maintaining an ongoing dedication to honesty and responsibility;

- * Trustworthiness by acting in a reliable and dependable manner;

. . . .

- * Compliance by following State and Federal laws and regulations and University policies related to their duties and responsibilities[.]

Computer Use Policy

The UIUC Campus's "Policy on Appropriate Use of Computers and Network Systems" provides in pertinent part as follows:

Purpose of UIUCnet, the campus computing and communications infrastructure: UIUCnet exists to support the educational, research, and public service missions of the University, and its use should be limited to those purposes.⁶

Appropriate Use of UIUCnet: No individual may use UIUCnet resources for . . . purposes that interfere with the mission of the University.

Proper Identity Required: Electronic mail and other forms of electronic communication must carry the proper identity of the sender at all times. Information servers (e.g., Web servers) must display the email address and identity of the unit or person responsible for maintaining the information.

Factual Chronology

Fall 2011

"UIAdvocate" Emails to Troyer & Ongoing USC Debate on Enrollment Management Proposal

Emails from Troyer's University email account indicate that on September 10, 2011, she began receiving information regarding the USC from a person using the email account uiadvocate@gmail.com. This account identified the individual associated with the account only as "Supporter."

Thirty-six emails from uiadvocate@gmail.com (the "uiadvocate Emails") were recovered from Troyer's University email account, most of which forward to Troyer emails containing communications among USC members. App. 5. Investigators have determined that USC Member and UIS professor Ting was the person using uiadvocate@gmail.com to send these emails to Troyer as a means of keeping Troyer apprised of USC developments.

During an interview with investigators from the University Ethics Office, Ting initially denied that she had sent Troyer the uiadvocate Emails. When further

⁶ The policy defines UIUCnet as "the campus computer and data communications infrastructure at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. It includes the campus backbone and local area networks, all equipment connected to those networks (independent of ownership), and all equipment registered to any domain name owned by the University."

confronted, however, she acknowledged having done so, noting that she did not consider the emails that she had forwarded to be confidential. Ting denied ever speaking with Troyer about the uiadvocate Emails, and stated and then reiterated that she had difficulty believing that Troyer had any involvement with the aboutuiintegrity Emails. Ting added that, even if Troyer had sent the aboutuiintegrity Emails, Hogan would not necessarily have known about them.

December 5, 2011

6:24 pm: Summary of December 5 UIUC Senate Meeting

At 6:24 pm on December 5, 2011, Jan Dennis, Assistant Director of the Office for University Relations, sent an email to Hogan, copied to Troyer, that attached a document summarizing a meeting of UIUC Senators earlier that day during which the enrollment management proposal was discussed.⁷ App. 6. Dennis's summary included the following observations:

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.

. . . .

Ruth Watkins, dean of LAS: Ruth said ***the composition of undergraduates . . . 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.

. . . .

Leslie Struble, an engineering professor and Senator: ***She criticized Mike [Hogan] for bypassing the campus*** in favor of the USC committee, and said that should be noted in the task force report.

⁷ This meeting was videotaped and can be viewed at <http://ensemble.atlas.uiuc.edu/app/sites/XMdT6pH9p0aodEYI4PZMEg.aspx>

App. 6. [Emphases added]

7:03 pm: Troyer Call to Hogan Regarding UIUC Senate Meeting

At 7:03 pm, Troyer called Hogan using her cell phone and spoke with him until 7:41 pm. In his interview with investigators, Hogan recalled discussing the December 5 UIUC Senate meeting with Troyer during this call.

7:16 pm: Troyer Laptop Used to Create goillini81@yahoo.com Email Account

Firefox session data artifacts found on the Troyer Laptop indicate that at 7:16 pm on December 5, while Troyer was on the phone with Hogan, this laptop was used to create a Yahoo! email account with the address goillini81@yahoo.com. The forensic analysis indicates that this is the first instance of Yahoo! mail usage on the Troyer Laptop.

Troyer denies having created this account with her laptop or otherwise, and also denies knowledge of the account. In his interview with investigators, Hogan stated that he had no knowledge of this account (or any Yahoo! account associated with Troyer) or whether Troyer was using her laptop during this call.

7:52 pm: Troyer Email to Ghosh re UIUC Senate Meeting

At 7:52 pm, Troyer, at Hogan's request, sent an email to Avijit Ghosh, Special Assistant to the President, attaching Dennis's summary of the December 5 UIUC meeting referenced above. App. 7. In her email to Ghosh, Troyer sought Ghosh's thoughts regarding statements that certain UIUC professors had made during the meeting:

Mike's [sic: Hogan] 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 [USC Member and Chair of the Enrollment Management Task Force Michael] 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.

It's also mystifying as to ***why they think they have [been] by-passed***, when ***Matt Wheeler and other senate leaders have had the external review report (in draft form early on) since July***, and final report since

September. I'm guessing *they never let this on* to the rank-and-file senators.

App. 7. [Emphases added]

8:03 pm: Troyer Starts Encouragement Email to Hogan, Then Stops

At 8:03 pm, Troyer began drafting an email to Hogan, using her laptop. This draft provides as follows:

Mike, I know the lack of support from some at UIUC for the initiatives you and the Board have established is discouraging. I know that it makes you feel like you're running in place. But, that's just not true. You've made big and very positive changes and many people know and appreciate that. There are many more positive comments in support of your vision and your work than negative ones in your e-mail, for instance.

I'm not so naive as to not understand the potential risks of a handful of people who have become lifetime senators and who will oppose any change (so long as they know about it). I think, however, that the Board

App. 8.

8:04 pm: Draft of Word Document Criticizing Certain UIUC Professors Prepared on Troyer Laptop

The forensic analysis shows that, for a short while, Troyer stopped drafting this email to Hogan, before completing the email and sending it to Hogan shortly before 9:00 pm (see below). In the meantime, the Troyer Laptop was used to compose a document in Word 2008 for Mac. App. 9. This Word document had been deleted but was recovered by means of forensic analysis. The metadata for the document indicates that it was created at 8:04 pm on December 5 (one minute after Troyer's uncompleted draft email to Hogan, see above).

The Word document bears several notable similarities with Dennis's summary of the December 5 UIUC Senate meeting and with Troyer's email to Ghosh. In particular, the document contains the following text:

I was at today's meeting and am embarrassed by my colleagues.

You should be ashamed of yourselves.

First, Matt [Wheeler], I know you *had the enrollment report last summer*. Today you *did not let on* that you never shared it when people at the meeting claimed the president has not been consulting faculty.

Second, Leslie [Struble], **how can you accuse the president of not consulting**, when he went through the right consultative body, the senate conference, which is in charge of taking up matters that involve all the campuses?

Third, Mike [sic; Mark Roszkowski], draw a **line in the sand**? The trustees made improving enrollment a goal for the president. But maybe Matt [Wheeler] and the chancellor [Phyllis Wise] didn't share that fact either. . . .

Fourth, dean [Watkins], respectfully, **did you actually read the full external report**? If you had, you'd know that it promotes that policy and admissions decisions be left up to the campuses.

App. 9. [Emphases added]

The recovered Word document is signed "Soon ex-senator" and is otherwise written as if the author were a member of the USC, albeit a disgruntled one: "I won't return to serve on the senate next year as it is nothing more than a bunch of whiners and losers who would rather see the university fail and throw good people under the bus." App. 9.

Word documents contain a variety of metadata indicating the "document properties," such as the author of the document. The Properties field in the metadata of this recovered document indicates that the author is "Lisa Troyer."

The fact that this recovered Word document was created on the Troyer Laptop almost simultaneously with Troyer's composition of a message to Hogan, along with the marked similarities between the document and the Troyer email to Ghosh strongly support the inference that Troyer drafted this Word document. Troyer denies having done so and, indeed, denies any knowledge of the Word document.

8:56 pm: Troyer Completes and Sends Encouragement Email to Hogan

Between 8:03 pm and 8:56 pm, Troyer completed her email to Hogan and provided a subject for the email ("you're doing the right thing"). Troyer picked up where she had left off earlier in the hour, and added the highlighted language below:

Mike, I know the lack of support from some at UIUC for the initiatives you and the Board have established is discouraging. I know that it makes you feel like you're running in place. But, that's just not true. You've made big and very positive changes and many people know and appreciate that. There are many more positive comments in support of your vision and your work than negative ones in your e-mail, for instance.

I'm not so naive as to not understand the potential risks of a handful of people who have become lifetime senators and who will oppose any change (so long as they know about it). I think, however, that the Board will back you on this, as they have on other initiatives.

Anyway, I'm sorry that this threw such a bad taste into your evening. You have a very good vision for the University and have fought battles you never should have had to fight. I admire that you do that, even when it is so hard.

I hope tomorrow gives you a new view and that you have a better day.

Sincerely,

Lisa

App. 10.

9:18 pm: First "Test" Email Sent from goillini81 to Troyer

The .pst file for Troyer's University email account (troyer@uillinois.edu) contained two deleted emails with the subject line "test." Both messages were sent from goillini81@yahoo.com to troyer@uillinois.edu, and no other recipient. The screen name for the goillini81 email account appears as "Morry Halled."⁸ Both "test" emails had been received, opened and deleted from Troyer's University email account. These emails were found in the "recoverable items: deletions" folder on the University's Microsoft Exchange server.

The first "test" email was sent at 9:18 pm on December 5. App. 11. This "test" email is virtually identical in structure and content to the Word document recovered from the Troyer Laptop described above, indicating that the text of the Word document was copied (or cut) and pasted into this email. The email states, in part:

I was at today's meeting and am embarrassed by my colleagues.

You should be ashamed of yourselves.

First Matt I know you **had the enrollment report last summer**. Today you **did not let on** that you never shared it when people at the meeting claimed the president has not been consulting faculty.

⁸ A review of U.S. public database records did not identify any records for an individual by this name.

Second Leslie ***how can you accuse the president of not consulting*** like he's supposed to when something involves all the campuses?

Third Mike [sic; Mark Roszkowski], draw a ***line in the sand***? You have to be kidding. The trustees made enrollment a goal for the president. But Matt didn't say a word about that either.

Fourth dean [Watkins] respectfully ***did you actually read the full external report?*** If you had, you'd know that it says that admissions decisions should be left up to the campuses.

App. 11. [Emphases added]

Unlike the recovered Word document, this email concluded by indicating that it would be provided to the President and others: "The president, trustees, and press need to know what went on here this afternoon and I'm copying them so they don't think all faculty in Urbana are lunatics."

The use of the Troyer Laptop to create this "test" email and the similarities between this email, the recovered Word document and the Troyer-to-Ghosh email strongly support the inference that Troyer drafted this test email. Here, too, Troyer denies having done so and denies any knowledge of the email.

10:41 pm: Second "Test" Email Sent from goillini81 to Troyer

The second "test" email recovered from the .pst file for Troyer's University email account was sent from goillini81@yahoo.com to Troyer's University account at 10:41 pm on December 5. App. 12. It also appears that, at 10:43 pm, someone prepared to forward this email from Troyer's account but did not in fact do so. App. 13.

The second "test" email maintains the structure shared by the recovered Word document and the first "test" email, and the content is likewise the same as these predecessor documents, with certain additional edits to portions of the text (e.g., changing the erroneous reference to "Mike" and correctly identifying this person as "Mark" (i.e., UIUC Senator Mark Roszkowski). The conclusion was again edited, this time to read: "President you need to know that this is not how we all think or how we all act. Students and faculty do care about improving our students [sic] success. Maybe its [sic] just senators who don't care." App. 12.

Here, again, the use of the Troyer Laptop to create this second "test" email and the similarities between this email, the first "test" email, the recovered Word document and the Troyer-to-Ghosh email strongly support the inference that Troyer drafted both test emails. Consistent with her related denials, Troyer denies having drafted this email and any knowledge of the email.

December 9 – 11, 2011

December 9 @ 4:14 am: Ting Forwards USC Task Force Draft Report to Troyer

At 4:14 am on December 9, Ting, using uiadvocate@gmail.com, forwarded to Troyer's University email account a copy of the draft report on the enrollment management proposal that had been prepared by an ad hoc USC task force (the "Enrollment Management Task Force"). App. 14.

December 10 @ 10:50 am: Ting Forwards USC Email Thread to Troyer

At 10:50 am, on December 10, Ting, using uiadvocate@gmail.com, forwarded to Troyer's University email account an email thread that included an email from Michael Biehl, the Chair of the Enrollment Management Task Force, to fellow UIUC Professor George Francis. In his email, Biehl explained his preferred strategy with respect to the enrollment management proposal:

One of the things I and [USC Member and UIUC professor] Nick [Burbules] 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 [enrollment management] 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 campus 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, , , , [sic] giving up your exact, specific, individual viewpoints for united, joint viewpoints that you and all other participants can ACCEPT.

App. 5.

December 10 @ 1:29 pm: Email from Hogan Updating Kennedy on Enrollment Management

At 1:29 pm on December 10, Hogan emailed Board Chair Kennedy with an update on matters related to enrollment management. App. 15. This email includes the following passage:

I also let [USC Chair] 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.

App. 15 [Emphasis added]

The email containing the anonymous information to which Hogan referred was the Biehl-to-Francis email described above, which was included verbatim in Hogan's email to Kennedy. App. 15.

In his interview with investigators, Hogan recalled this email to Kennedy, but did not specifically recall whether he drafted the email himself or whether Troyer drafted it on his behalf. In an interview with investigators, Troyer recalled working with Hogan over the weekend of December 10-11 to update Kennedy on the enrollment management issue and to prepare emails for Kennedy to send to others on this issue, see below. With regard to this particular email, Troyer recalled drafting this email with Hogan's input. This email was found in Troyer's sent email folder.⁹

⁹ Troyer had access to Hogan's University email account and, with Hogan's authorization, regularly reviewed incoming emails to that account to determine, among other things, whether responses were in order. Troyer often drafted responses to be sent under Hogan's signature; Hogan typically reviewed and approved substantive responses before they were sent, but did not regularly review non-substantive responses.

December 11: Emails to Chancellors and USC Chair

At 2:04 pm on December 11, Hogan sent Kennedy draft emails intended for ultimate distribution to the Chancellors of the three University campuses and Chambers. App. 16. These emails, which Kennedy reviewed and edited, generally expressed the Board of Trustees' alignment with the President in support of the enrollment management proposal and requested that the recipients communicate the same to their respective campuses and colleagues.

After editing these emails, Kennedy sent them to the intended recipients (with copies to Hogan and others). The Chancellors and Chambers, in turn, responded to Kennedy, indicating general agreement (or at least not indicating disagreement) with Kennedy's request. App. 17.

In his response to Kennedy (copied to Hogan and others, but not Troyer), Chambers noted that "we are one University with three campuses . . . at different degrees of maturity, with somewhat different missions and certainly different histories." Similarly, Chambers observed: "Where one size fits all, we should employ that size. However, we need to be aware that in the academic community, the three campuses are viewed differently." Chambers also remarked: "As for enrolment [sic] management, the USC EM Committee is in the final stages of making its report to the Conference. How the president acquired a draft, is beyond me but it certainly wasn't meant for anyone else's eyes." Hogan forwarded this message to Troyer at 8:33 pm on December 11. App. 18.

December 11: Troyer's Evening Telephone Calls

Telephone records supplied by Troyer show three calls between Troyer and Ting, and one call between Troyer and Hogan, during the evening of December 11:

- 7:18 pm: Troyer / Ting (1 min; outgoing from Troyer's phone to Springfield)
- 7:47 pm: Troyer / Ting (41 mins; incoming to Troyer's phone)
- 10:16 pm: Troyer / Hogan (10 mins; incoming to Troyer's phone)
- 11:34 pm: Troyer / Ting (13 mins; incoming to Troyer's phone)

December 12, 2011

7:45 am: Draft of First Anonymous Email

Through forensic analysis, a document that appears to be an earlier draft of the First Anonymous Email was identified on the Troyer Laptop. App. 19. The metadata of this document indicates that it was created on December 12, 2011, at 7:45 am, and was composed in Word for Mac 2008, the version of Word installed

on the Troyer Laptop. This file was deleted but not overwritten. Duff & Phelps recovered it from the unallocated space of the Troyer Laptop.

8:55 am: Creation of aboutuiintegrity Email Account

Network logs establish that the Troyer Laptop logged into the University of Illinois network at 8:52 am. In addition, forensic evidence indicates that the aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com account was created from the Troyer Laptop at 8:55 am.

11:56 am: The First Anonymous Email

Firefox session data shows that a Yahoo! email was composed on the Troyer Laptop at 11:44 am. App. 20.

Firewall logs confirm the outbound connection between the University network and Yahoo! at 11:56 am, the time at which the First Anonymous Email was sent.

An IP (or Internet Protocol) address is the network equivalent of a mailing address, identifying the specific location of a piece of network equipment. The IP address recorded in the header of the First Anonymous Email corresponds to Troyer's work IP address.

The First Anonymous Email was sent to members of the USC, whose email addresses had been entered individually. The First Anonymous Email message states in part:

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. 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. . . . [I]t is time to start treating one another with respect and to exercise integrity in carrying out our statutory duties. . . .

App. 1. [Emphases added]

Note that this email addresses the theme of forced consensus that is also evident in the December 5 "test" emails, and, in this regard, also references "statutes," requiring the disclosure of internal disagreement in the same way that the December 10 email from Hogan to Kennedy (drafted by Troyer) referenced these "statutes."

It should also be noted that the First Anonymous Email clearly attempts to deflect attention away from the person who forwarded the Enrollment Management Task Force's draft report—namely, Ting, who, as noted above, had sent the report to Troyer using the uiadvocate@gmail.com account.

As set forth further below, Troyer asserts that she was in a meeting with Christophe Pierre at the time that this email was sent (11:56 am). By contrast, during his interview with investigators, Pierre indicated that he did not begin his meeting with Troyer until after noon on December 12.

7:49 pm – 8:18 pm: The Second Anonymous Email

Two responses to the First Anonymous Email were sent by USC members in the evening of December 12. These replies objected to the anonymous nature of the email.

At 8:18 pm, the Second Anonymous Email was sent from aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com, replying to those responses as follows:

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>¹⁰

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

App. 2.

Forensic evidence has established that the Second Anonymous Email was also composed on, and sent from, the Troyer Laptop.

At all relevant times, Troyer used the same MacBook Air laptop both at home and at work. As she explained to investigators, when at home, Troyer obtained network connectivity by tethering her laptop via Bluetooth to her cell phone. Her laptop was assigned a unique IP address from her phone provider for each session.

A Firefox session data artifact shows that at 7:49 pm on December 12 (12 minutes after the Troyer Laptop logged onto the University's Windows Remote Desktop Service using Troyer's credentials), the email thread of responses by recipients of the First Anonymous Email, the text of the Second Anonymous Email, and the addresses of the recipients to which that email was sent were accessed together in the same browser session. App. 21.

Cookies from yahoo.mail.com show that the Troyer Laptop accessed Yahoo! mail at 8:18 pm, the time at which the Second Anonymous Email was sent. The header of the Second Anonymous Email contains the same IP address that was

¹⁰ This link connects to a video of the December 5, 2011 meeting of the USC Senate.

assigned by Troyer's phone provider to the Troyer Laptop during that evening's tethering session.

8:26 pm: Email from USC Member Suggesting Troyer Sent First Anonymous Email

At 8:26 pm on December 12 (eight minutes after the Second Anonymous Email had been sent) Roy Campbell, a USC member and computer science professor at the UIUC campus, responded to the recipients of the First Anonymous Email (the "Campbell Email"). App. 3. This response noted that the text of the First Anonymous Email appeared to have been composed in Word 2008. The text therefore contained information from the Word 2008 application, and this information indicated that the email had been composed on a computer containing the user account "troyer." Specifically, this filepath was embedded in the document:

file://localhost/Users/troyer/Library/Cache=s/TemporaryItems/msoclip/0clip_filelist.xml.

In his email, Campbell cautioned against assuming the identity of the author or assigning "any blame about the anonymous email" based on his finding, noting that this "email can so easily be faked or copied from another document."

8:27 pm – 8:44 pm: Troyer Communications with Ting

At 8:27 pm, Ting called Troyer, and they spoke for 11 minutes (i.e., until approximately 8:38).

At 8:43 pm on December 12, Ting, using uiadvocate@gmail.com, forwarded the Campbell Email to Troyer. App. 5.

At 8:44, Troyer called Ting, and they spoke for 4 minutes on this occasion (i.e., until approximately 8:48 pm).

In her interview with investigators, Ting recalled speaking with Troyer on multiple occasions during the evening of December 12. According to Ting, during one of these calls, Troyer expressed concern that her computer had been hacked and stated that she intended to call Executive CIO Michael Hites (which Troyer proceeded to do, see below).

8:52 pm – 8:55 pm: Efforts to Delete Information from Troyer Laptop

At 8:52 pm, a search for the term "permanent delete" was performed on the Troyer Laptop using the operating system's built-in help utility.

Three minutes later, at 8:55 pm, the “secure erase” function provided by the Mac OSX Disk Utility was started on the Troyer Laptop. This function is used to ensure that deleted and temporary files on a computer cannot be recovered by forensic tools. App. 22. The default setting for “secure erase” overwrites free space one time. The setting on the Troyer Laptop was at some point manually changed to overwrite this data 35 times. (The only options provided are 1, 7 or 35 times.) Overwriting the data 35 times would take many hours, if not days. Ten seconds after the function was initiated, the user stopped it. The log file indicates that the utility had never been used on the Troyer Laptop prior to this date.

8:56 pm– 11:07 pm: Additional Phone Calls

At 8:56 pm, Troyer called Hogan, and they spoke for 14 minutes (i.e., until approximately 9:10 pm). According to Hogan, Troyer explained that her computer might have been hacked, and he advised her to contact Michael Hites. Troyer then called Hites at 9:11 pm.

Later that evening, Troyer spoke with Hogan two additional times, Ting three additional times, and Hites four additional times. During her interviews with investigators, Troyer denied that she had sent (or attempted to destroy) the aboutuiintegrity Emails (or that she had acknowledged doing so to anyone during any of these December 12 phone calls). Hogan likewise advised investigators that Troyer did not then (or ever) admit to having sent the anonymous emails in question (or any anonymous emails).

December 12, 2011: Troyer’s Possible Deletion of Data Related to Prior Employment

In interviews with investigators, Troyer stated that she has no knowledge of the search for “permanent delete” or the use of “secure erase” detailed above. She did, however, acknowledge deleting data from her laptop on the night of December 12.

Specifically, Troyer said that her laptop contained a folder of documents she had obtained while working for another academic institution. She characterized that information as “proprietary,” and noted that she was concerned about the possibility that a hacker might gain access to these documents.

No evidence pertaining to the documents Troyer claimed to have deleted were identified on the Troyer Laptop. Troyer stated that she used a secure delete function to remove these files, and such a procedure would have removed all forensic trace of the files in question.

Troyer also stated that she ran “Terminal” on the night of December 12. Terminal is a software utility included within the Mac operating system that enables

users to interact with the computer through a command line interface, which among other things permits the user to access the system core. Usage of this utility would likely have modified or deleted some evidence from the Troyer Laptop. No artifacts identifying the use of Terminal were identified.

In an interview, Troyer stated that she attempted to run Sophos Antivirus but that it did not work correctly. Forensic analysis of the Troyer Laptop shows that, although the virus definitions in her copy of Sophos are out of date, the program was capable of completing a scan.

Physical Security of the Troyer Laptop

This investigation has determined that Troyer was in possession of the Troyer Laptop at all relevant times and that no unauthorized third-party access to the machine itself occurred.

The University IT Department conducted a review of the environment at Troyer's office to evaluate whether a third-party could have physically obtained access to her computer around the time of the First Anonymous Email without detection. It concluded that the arrangement of the offices, administrative assistants, and an in-use conference room precluded the possibility that anyone could have accessed her computer without detection.¹¹

On December 5, 2011, Troyer was using her laptop for University business in and around the times when forensic evidence shows the creation and use of the Yahoo! mail account goillini81@yahoo.com. Troyer sent an email from her University Outlook account at 7:52 pm, and then, as noted above, began drafting an email to Hogan at 8:03 pm on her laptop. At 8:04 pm, the text of the "test" message was drafted in Word 2008 on the Troyer Laptop. At 8:56 pm, the email to Hogan that was begun at 8:03 pm was sent from Troyer's University email account. At 9:18 pm, the first "test" message was sent from goillini81@yahoo.com to Troyer's University email account. In order for a third-party to have created the Yahoo! mail account on the Troyer Laptop, drafted the text of the "test" message, sent "test" messages to Troyer's University account and subsequently deleted them without her knowledge, that third-party would have had to periodically exchange access to the laptop back and forth with Troyer while she conducted University business at essentially the same time.

Troyer maintains that she was in a conference with Pierre during the time that the First Anonymous Email was sent (11:56 am), and that she therefore could not have sent it. Troyer and Pierre have offered differing accounts of the chronology of that morning's events. According to Pierre, he arrived in Troyer's office around

¹¹ Duff & Phelps did not independently verify this conclusion.

12:10 pm or 12:15 pm, and their meeting was interrupted shortly thereafter by a phone call from Hogan. Troyer's phone records show a phone call from Hogan to Troyer at 12:16 pm. Troyer says that their meeting began earlier and that Pierre was in her office at the time that the 11:56 am email was sent.

Troyer has stated in her interviews that no other member of the President's Office staff has access to her computer or her email account. She also stated that while her husband does know her computer password, she remained in physical control of the laptop throughout the evening and night of December 12.

Troyer maintains that she did not send either of the aboutuiintegrity Emails, that she has no knowledge of the "test" messages, and that she has never used Yahoo! mail. If a third-party were responsible for the creation and distribution of the anonymous emails, they would have had to obtain unauthorized access to the Troyer Laptop remotely.

As such, the investigative team undertook an extensive analysis of the University network security and the network logs relating to the time the December 5 and December 12 anonymous emails were created and sent.

Hacking Analysis

In addition to reviewing the forensic artifacts on the Troyer Laptop to determine whether the anonymous emails were created on that machine, Duff & Phelps also reviewed the work conducted by the University's IT Department and performed an independent review of certain network and session data to determine whether the Troyer Laptop had been remotely accessed or "hacked" by a third party. The University's IT Department performed an in-depth analysis of the firewall logs and network activity which was well designed to detect any remote access of the Troyer Laptop.

The following investigative steps were undertaken by Duff & Phelps:

- (1) The file systems on the Troyer Laptop were scanned for any known virus, malware, Trojan, or other potentially malicious software with no positive results.
- (2) Duff & Phelps verified that system activity on the Troyer Laptop was consistent with network activity reported by the University IT Department, and found no inconsistencies that would indicate malicious activity.
- (3) The system logs and startup scripts were analyzed for any abnormalities. Only one service log showed a service interruption. Further investigation with security sites and the National Vulnerability Database revealed no known exploits related to the crash of this service that could cause a remote hijack of the system.

(4) A live system analysis of the image provided by the University IT Department was done in order to verify proper operation of the laptop's firewall and verify that no malicious software was present on the laptop attempting to contact an unauthorized computer.

No unusual activity was identified, nor were any other signs indicating remote access of the Troyer Laptop by a third party.

In an interview with investigators, Troyer described what she considered to be unusual activity on her computer and the University network, which she presented as evidence supporting her contention that an unauthorized third-party had accessed her computer. She noted that the IT Department had documented network traffic involving her laptop on December 12, 2011, from 10:00 am and 11:30 am, during the time when she was in meetings and not at her computer. The IT Department reviewed this traffic and concluded that it was not indicative of unauthorized access, but rather indicated that her computer had been left connected to a Yahoo.com website which periodically refreshed itself.

Troyer also described concerns related to the loaner and replacement computers she was assigned when her laptop was acquired for forensic analysis, as well as alleged problems with email and network access she attributed to unidentified staffers. App. 23. These problems included error messages that occurred during the use of her University email account. App. 24.

The IT Department concluded that these concerns were not indicative of any unauthorized access of University network systems, and Duff & Phelps' independent analysis of the data revealed no evidence of any unauthorized intrusion into the University network systems.

In order for an outside party to obtain unauthorized access to the Troyer Laptop in such a way as to have been responsible for the anonymous emails, the following would have needed to occur:

- The third-party would have needed information about Troyer's work habits and whereabouts, and the ability to insert unauthorized activity in between Troyer's documented activity without Troyer's awareness.
- The third-party would have needed to be able to pass through the University's AITS firewall as well as over the campus network without leaving any trace in any of the multiple campus network and security devices.
- The third-party would have needed to be able to pass through the Troyer Laptop's firewall without leaving any trace.
- The third-party would have needed to be able to send "test" emails from the Troyer Laptop to Troyer's University email account, and after having done so, would have needed to be able to access her email account

in order to delete those same “test” messages and then empty the Outlook trash folder before Troyer saw them.

- The third-party would have needed to be able to leave behind selected artifacts on the Troyer Laptop implicating its user in the creation of the emails.
- The third-party would have needed to secretly conduct a search for the term “permanent delete,” and then initiate and abort the running of “secure erase.” These would have needed to be carefully prepared in order to leave deliberate forensic traces but not any onscreen indication to the user. The third-party would have needed to run the wiping utility just long enough to leave the implicating indication that it had been run but not long enough to undo any of the false trails that had been planted on the Troyer Laptop beforehand.
- The third-party would have needed extensive, detailed and current information about the various discussions and issues surrounding the enrollment management issue.

Interview with Hogan

The investigative team consisting of Jones Day, Duff & Phelps, and the University Ethics Office, joined by the University Counsel, interviewed Hogan on January 10, 2012.

As noted above, Hogan indicated no prior knowledge of the goillini81@yahoo.com account that Troyer apparently created during her phone conversation with him on December 5.

Hogan denied any and all prior knowledge of the existence of the emails from uiadvocate@gmail.com.

Hogan stated that when Troyer informed him of anonymous emails in the evening of December 12, he encouraged her to contact University IT personnel immediately. He said that throughout the investigation process, he has encouraged Troyer to be cooperative and forthcoming. He said that at all times throughout this investigation, Troyer has consistently denied having any role in the creation or sending of the anonymous emails from aboutuiintegrity@yahoo.com, and has consistently maintained that her computer must have been hacked.

Hogan said that he initially believed Troyer’s account, based on their shared professional history and his belief in her integrity.

Findings & Conclusions

1. No Evidence of Hacking or Vulnerabilities in University Network. A thorough examination of the Troyer Laptop, its contents, and logs of network activity has not produced any indication that the University's network was compromised or that the Troyer Laptop was hacked or improperly accessed (e.g., remotely accessed by a third-party). Put simply, Troyer's claims regarding the hacking of her laptop are contrary to the forensic analysis and other findings of this investigation.

2. Troyer Laptop Used to Create and Send December 12 Anonymous Emails. Browser activity, firewall logs, email headers and email fragments found on the Troyer Laptop all indicate that the two anonymous emails sent on December 12 were created and sent from that laptop. Session data and network logs indicate that the Troyer Laptop accessed Yahoo! at the time the emails were sent. A wiping utility was initiated and then aborted on the Troyer Laptop almost immediately after Troyer was informed of the allegation that she had authored the anonymous emails.

3. Troyer Laptop Used to Create December 5 Test Emails. Other artifacts identified on the Troyer Laptop indicate that the December 5 "test" emails were also created using the Troyer Laptop. In fact, the obvious similarities between these test emails (and the related Word document), on the one hand, and the email that Troyer had sent to Ghosh earlier that same evening, on the other hand, strongly support the inference that Troyer drafted the test emails and sent them to herself, before eventually deleting them.

4. Troyer's Involvement in December 12 Anonymous Emails. Based on (i) the absence of evidence indicating that the Troyer Laptop was hacked or improperly accessed, (ii) the evidence of computer possession, control and usage on Troyer's part, and (iii) the opportunity, motive, and concealment information developed in this investigation, it is reasonable to infer that Troyer composed and sent the anonymous emails, falsely representing herself to be a Senator. With respect to opportunity, motive, and concealment, in particular, the investigation revealed that Troyer –

(a) was in possession of the Troyer Laptop at all relevant times;

(b) was well aware of the status of the debate among Senators over the enrollment management proposal through her own monitoring efforts and through missives that she received from Ting;

(c) was keenly interested in, and motivated to, advance the President's and Board's agenda with respect to the enrollment management proposal, as a key member of the University's leadership team and someone deeply loyal to Hogan;

(d) had reviewed documents that, at least in part, appeared to have served as an impetus for the anonymous emails (e.g., the Biehl email to Francis, Chambers' response to Kennedy); and

(e) attempted to delete relevant and damaging information from her laptop after becoming aware of the Campbell Email.

5. Involvement of Others in aboutuiintegrity Emails or in the Creation of the goillini81 Emails. The investigative record does not support a conclusion that anyone other than Troyer knew of and/or participated in the creation and dissemination of the aboutuiintegrity Emails or in the creation of the goillini81 Emails.