

Employee Survey on President finalist Amy Parsons

Update - December 13, 2022

This document provides the Board with updated Presidential Finalist Survey results. The first document provided results as of Saturday, 12/10 at 12:00 pm. The response here are those we received from then until the survey close at 5:00 pm Monday, 12/12.

On Tuesday December 6 faculty council voted to survey all employees for their opinions of president finalist Amy Parsons. The survey asks three questions – strengths, weaknesses and comments for the Board or Faculty Council leadership along with employee classification (administrative professional, faculty, state classified or other). The survey was delivered in both English and Spanish and launched Thursday December 8 at 9:00 am. Settings in the Qualtrics survey platform were set to allow only one submission per computer. Every employee at CSU-FC received the following email (in English and in Spanish) inviting them to participate:

Colleagues,

As you are aware, [Amy Parsons has been nominated by the CSU Board of Governors](#) as the sole finalist for the position of President of Colorado State University, Fort Collins.

*Faculty Council passed a resolution at its December meeting Tuesday afternoon to send a survey to all faculty and staff seeking feedback so we may better inform the Board before they vote to offer this candidate the position. The survey is being administered by and the results will be collected by Faculty Council elected officers. This survey is completely anonymous. **We are not collecting any personally-identifying information, and we will not be able to link your survey response to you in any way.** If you choose to include identifying information in your open-ended responses, we will not share this information with the Board of Governors and Chancellor. This survey is optional.*

Please complete this survey by Monday, December 12 at 5:00 pm to ensure that your voice is heard.

From noon Saturday to survey close, we received an additional 111 opens from 60 faculty, 33 Administrative Professionals, and 7 State Classified and 5 describing their position as ‘other’. Six additional surveys were opened but no data was entered. This brings the total number of responses received for the duration of the survey to 860 opens, with 365, 282, 53, and 24 responses from Faculty, Administrative Professional, State Classified and ‘Other’, respectively.

The results in the following pages are un-edited, except to remove information that could identify an individual respondent.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She knows CSU, though that can be as much of a weakness as a strength.

Candidate Weaknesses: It's hard to know where to begin. Amy is completely unqualified to be president of CSU. Not only does she lack any relevant experience in the two critical parts of our mission (academics and research), she does not have the values or integrity to be a good president, even if she worked on developing competencies in the areas with which she is unfamiliar. I have worked directly with Amy and have numerous examples that demonstrate her lack of integrity, her arrogance, and her unwillingness to listen. I can't detail those examples here because that would give away the anonymity of this survey, and I don't trust that Amy won't somehow get wind of who said what and would fire me. I have that little faith in Amy's decency or integrity. If Amy becomes president, I, and many others, would live in fear of retaliation that if we don't do exactly as she says, even when our best professional judgment indicates we shouldn't, she would simply get rid of us. She doesn't care about people, and staff are a disposable resource for her to use (and abuse). She comes from a privileged background, and has been favored and privileged by Tony. She doesn't try to understand or own up to her privilege - she flaunts it. Amy's hire would set CSU back a decade or more in terms of DEI work and credibility.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I have dusted off my resume and started looking for other jobs. I just can't work for/with Amy Parsons again, nor for an institution which thinks someone like Amy Parsons should be our president. It's sad and disheartening - CSU is a great institution, being run like a mom and pop shop where your position is determined by who you know and not by your qualifications. And if Amy becomes president (or rather, when Amy becomes president, as I'm sure it's a done deal and completing this survey is an exercise in futility), there will be such drama and disengagement across campus, it will be impossible for any real work to get done. Even if the Board thinks Amy is the most qualified candidate, do they really want to risk the negative PR, the contentious campus climate and the turmoil that will result from her hire? Couldn't we hire someone who isn't already a known negative force? Couldn't we hire someone with high standards, integrity, and relevant experience, that we could all get behind from Day 1, to help lead CSU into the future?

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with culture of CSU and Fort Collins community in general, going back many years.

Candidate Weaknesses: Dearth of academic experience - both in research and education. The experiences listed as qualifications for the role of president read more as weaknesses. The projects she oversaw to completion were, by in large, almost all controversial and questionable unto themselves. It's unclear whether any of the three (the stadium, Todos Santos or the Spur) provide any return on investment or value to the mission of CSU. Instead they fostered division, doubt and debt within the university and community - the same as this unsubstantiated candidate nomination.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: This nomination is a disservice to gender equity and the values of a land grant institution of higher education. While it would be admirable to appoint a woman to this role, selecting someone on the sole basis that she is willing to do the bidding of the board is antithetical to the mission of our university and, quite frankly, an insult to every well-qualified, high achieving woman who has dedicated her career to academics. This sends the message that CSU cares not for the quality of education, research or employment provided, but only for the creation of satellite campuses, growth of the CSU image and brand and building of new structures, all which belie the values of every CSU Ram I know.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Has worked within the CSU system closely.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not sure if she has worked in education beyond the CSU system

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Based on materials provided, and not having been someone that has previously worked with the nominee, Ms. Parsons seems connected to and inspired by the University's Land Grant Mission, and in continuing the work begun by Dr. McConnell to address the biggest issues facing CSU in the coming years - such as access, inclusivity, and rising costs of living. It could be argued that Ms. Parsons understands the CSU System from previous work with the system, and is specifically to be aware of the culture of the Fort Collins Flagship campus after being a major reason why CSUFC's culture is where it is after serving as it's Vice President for University Operations through a period of intense change. I find it encouraging that Ms. Parsons recognizes and owns their privilege as a white female.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy's weaknesses for me begin with a lack of articulated vision for where CSU is going next. While it is admirable that Amy would like to build on CSU's current strengths, I do not understand what that means, or where our next steps lead us.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: For any leader, it is just as important that they have the right people around them to support and implement their vision, I look forward to seeing the team that Ms. Parsons builds around herself if selected to serve as our next President.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy Parsons has a close relationship with Tony Frank and that will likely help CSU - Fort Collins.

Amy Parsons is a better choice than one former Dean of the College of Business and College of Agricultural Sciences.

Candidate Weaknesses: Diversity, equity, and inclusion: Parsons names three items as evidence of her support of diversity and access, the Ripple Effect, Todos Santos, and the salary equity exercise. The Ripple Effect was a disaster before Tony Frank asked Cori Wong to take it over. Todos Santos had a terrible reputation before Kim Kita took it over. And, the salary equity exercise was led by women faculty, not Amy. Amy Parsons is a known obstacle to diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives.

Credentials: Amy Parsons does not have the academic OR business experience to gain the respect of the faculty.

Climate and culture, trustworthiness: Amy became the Vice President of University Operations without a search and she was also appointed to Vice Chancellor without a search. This feels like another Tony Frank, appointment. She has no trustworthiness to fix the climate and culture issues destroying the CSU employee base.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Please consider hiring Joe Garcia who is a proven university president with strong connections in the Colorado State government, has experience leading two Hispanic Serving Institutions, and has a real understanding of both rural Colorado and diversity, equity, and inclusion.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy has a broad level of experience both at CSU and in the private sector that in my opinion will give CSU the balance and the vision it needs moving forward in these ever changing times. I also believe that Amy deeply cares about CSU!

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of commitment to DEIJ, sustainability, or international relations. Lack of experience, awareness, or appreciation for the central mission of a research, land-grant institution: teaching, research, working with faculty, and serving all students.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: CSU faculty and administrators are understandably troubled by the selection of Amy Parsons as the sole finalist for president, especially given her weak academic experience. This is a critical time for our institution, as we face major compensation issues for our employees and new challenges to student success. If Ms. Parsons is selected as president, CSU will need a very strong provost and cabinet to compensate for her weaknesses, and we will need additional, unwavering support (financial and ideological) from the Board of Governors to maintain our institution and accomplish our strategic goals.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Being Rick Miranda's lap dog and accentuating the boys club. So much for hope eh? Benefitting from doing whatever the boys club tells her to do.

Candidate Weaknesses: Caring about the arts, knowing how education works. Having the ability to fight the patriarch and overpower some super ridiculous boys club standards that have been maintained for way too long.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: You seriously couldn't bring in any other candidates? Not even one BIPOC candidate? Do you seriously think the university will benefit from someone who's ok with how it's been running when it obviously hasn't been keeping up with social and societal changes? Stop hiring your cronies to do your bidding Rick and Tony. Improve the buildings that haven't been touched or noticed in decades believe it or not the ARTS are important but you wouldn't know it from how y'all focus on your football and hiring all your buddies while getting rid of someone who was finally making some good changes and noticing the entire university. Guess you forgot what it's like to live on a salary less than 40,000 because you sure as heck don't seem to care about equity. Have fun continuing to white wash everything by pretending there's not any issues across campus because why would an older cis white male notice anything that doesn't have to do with their own vested interests eh? (P.s saying oh but she's a woman therefor we ticked the diversity box is a slap in the face to anyone who's been trying to fight for a modicum of equity in your bullshit system you continue to promote and value)

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: 1. Many years of experience at CSU (less learning curve, if any).

2. Amy played a central role in the launch of the new football stadium, Spur, and Todos Santos. She has already proven herself in her ability to develop the university.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Many employees are commenting on Amy's lack of faculty experience. I don't see this as a weakness. Presidency is a very different skillset.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long association with CSU and strong working relationship with executive leadership at the FC campus and at the Systems level.

Her resume points to a successful & impressive career trajectory.

Candidate Weaknesses: Having mentioned the strengths of the candidate, there are some acute deficiencies in her experience, particularly on the academic side, that have to be pointed out.

It would seem that the leader of a Carnegie Research 1 institution would come from a teaching & research background. Amy Parsons has no academic credentials to speak of.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Once again, the campus is kept in the dark about the other finalists that were interviewed. Many of the questions about the candidate's suitability to lead the campus could be avoided if campus could be more involved in the process. Why can't there be an open Q&A session with campus?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: None identifiable as pertains to the role of President.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of academic/faculty experience (teaching, research, advising, P & T,

Faculty Council, department committees/issues, and on and on)

Lack of DEIJ experience or mention (one of CSU's key initiatives)

Lack of accreditation experience - HLC accreditation coming up next year

History of punting projects off to others when the going gets tough, but taking the credit for the project.

Clear and projected sense of entitlement.

Lack of national education experience/connection (i.e. APLU)

Questionable relationship history with Tony Frank

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I will never be convinced that out of 61 applicants this is the best we can do. Being an alum and having a child who is a student here in no way qualifies one to be the president of the University. It is preposterous to state that an already overworked and underpaid faculty should train the new President.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Extensive CSU background from being a student, employee, and parent. Knows the operations side very well.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate has very weak DEI and academic experience, so does not represent the whole university. She also does not seem approachable to the whole campus community. She seems to primarily represent the interest of the CSU Systems office.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: This candidate is needing to unify the whole campus community and needs to represent and be able to speak to and for students, faculty, staff, and other members of our community. As I BIPOC employee, this is very important to me and many others. BOG, please reconsider your choice for our next president!

Thank you!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Previous experience at CSU and with the CSU system; understands CSU's role in Colorado and the Mountain West; understands the operations side of CSU very well.

Candidate Weaknesses: No faculty experience; no experience as a president or provost of a university, which sort of feels necessary for a leading R1 university; the perception that this presidency will simply be an extension of Tony Frank's leadership.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: As an admin pro, I appreciate having someone who has a deep understanding of the operations of a university. I don't really have any feelings about Amy Parsons as president one way or another. I can understand why having someone with a faculty background could be preferable. My only concern is that, as an R1 of our caliber, we should be able to find someone who is already a sitting president or provost with a good track record for successfully running a large public R1.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU Alum and Parent

CSU Employment History

Candidate Weaknesses: Connection to Faculty?

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Special project delivery.

Donor engagement.

Candidate Weaknesses: Demonstrated unwillingness to meet sustainability initiatives of the university for the sake of delivering new buildings to CSU. She failed to meet LEED GOLD certification requirements of the State of Colorado for recently constructed buildings including the Stadium. These buildings will burden the university for decades with higher energy usage due to poor construction and energy inefficiency.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Faculty Council should be the voice for sustainability through construction at CSU. Faculty are the primary user of our campus buildings along with the students they engage. Our buildings should be a model for sustainability and be paired in curriculum. We can't continue to construct inefficient buildings like the Richardson Design Center that don't match the energy efficiency and sustainability goals for CSU--instead they will burden CSU with higher utility bills and renovation costs over the life of the building (80% of the costs of the building come after it is constructed).

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Leadership, business, donor relations, CSU system.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lacking in teaching

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I believe that Amy will be a good leader and is a good fit for CSU.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Articulate, enthusiastic, knows CSU budget and processes, has institutional knowledge

Candidate Weaknesses: Has no experience as a tenure-track faculty member or researcher and has never dealt directly with university students. Has a poor reputation among many people who have worked with her.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: After the failed presidency of Joyce McConnell - with ripple effects still becoming apparent - now is NOT the time to experiment with a nontraditional president. Amy Parsons is nontraditional in that she has limited direct experience dealing with the most important aspects of a top-tier research university; namely, students, faculty, and research. Her prior positions at CSU provided primarily indirect interactions - she wasn't on the front lines with the campus community's core constituencies, nor has she conducted research or scholarship. She has the reputation among many people she has worked with as having poor instincts and judgment and conducting herself in a manner that is consistently preening, shallow, and condescending. The attitude of a litigator does not work well for the university's top leader. Kim Jordan's comment that Parsons is "palpably fabulous" says it all. We've had an "extraordinary" president, to quote McConnell's favorite term. We need a president who has laudable experience as a university president or leader with critical experience, who is of the academy, and who is both serious and selfless.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: None

Candidate Weaknesses: The finalist lacks a background in academics, I'm concerned that this candidate will not have the academic/student related knowledge or background to be successful in the President position. Despite her background with CSU, it seems odd to hire a CEO without a significant academic background into a University President position. Based on the candidate's background and communication around this candidate, it seems she will need a lot of support to succeed in the position that a more qualified candidate wouldn't need.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I have had concerns about the transparency of this process. For example, that it seems like feedback was not going to be collected until others put this form together after the announcement.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy is competent at identifying key people in power. People that further her cause.

Candidate Weaknesses: “People will not remember what you say. They will remember how you made them feel” I have had multiple work experiences with Amy Parsons and walk away each time baffled. Low EQ, project failure, condescension, no research or teaching experience and an attitude that is counter productive for the university. This is a repeat of the last president and seemingly glib vs best for CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: This seems more of a private club decision versus what is best for a research university. I firmly believe there were candidates with appropriate experience and background. Same mistake the board made with our last president.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU

Proven track record at CSU

Dedication to CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of academic background

Unsure whether personality is inspiring

2 lawyers in a row

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She has strong leadership skills, 'soft people' skills, and great administrative skills. Which is what the president needs.

Candidate Weaknesses: As a land grant institution having zero agriculture background is a red flag for my area as an agricultural research center representative.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: There is feedback why only 1 candidate is shown, but I personally understand that it hurts the other candidates standing at their current institution.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Different background than usual presidents. Connection to CSU. Experience outside of higher ed AND inside higher ed. Connections to different parts of CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Too soon to tell. On paper, I think Amy could be great for CSU

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Glad that she previously worked at CSU and familiar with the system and the culture. I hope this will help for sustaining the position.

Candidate Weaknesses: I do not see any serious weaknesses.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: She did teach the law class in the SAHE academic program. She has several highly professional VPS to help with issues of research or academics. I think she has the administrative skills, the background, and the insights to be a great president. Her familiarity with CSU will bring stability to the position.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Is familiar with CSU's culture and operations

Will work well with Tony and Rick

Candidate Weaknesses: Doesn't have the confidence of the faculty

Hasn't had a lot of higher ed experience outside of CSU which gives her a linear view of the work- how will she bring new ideas?

Will need a strong Provost at her side

Will not challenge the status quo- essentially, it's just like having Tony at the helm

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Please don't be like CU and hire the wrong person despite the feedback that is being given. Carefully take the time to listen to the people who have taken the time to respond to this survey. CSU can do better, let's put the effort into finding the right person. While no one is perfect, this is not the right fit for CSU. The University is already suffering from the deep turnover in leadership.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: To be honest, I really do not know Amy's strengths. There was a lack of transparency around the search process. Who were the other candidates? What were their qualifications?

Candidate Weaknesses: I think the major weakness is that we have never seen Amy in a leadership role within a higher education setting. The world of business as a CEO is different than leadership within a university.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: What type of research and grant writing experience does Amy have? What is her experience with DEI work and equity work around being a land-grant institution? What is her experience juggling very different needs (financial/time/IT/infrastructure/etc.) across groups (on-campus, online, collaboration campuses, the CSU System, research, teaching, coursework, Extension, CEMML, etc.)? What is her vision for pushing CSU, which is steeped in many traditional educational policies/procedures/practices, into practices that will attract the modern student to attend and prepare the modern student for tomorrow's careers?

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy knows the CSU system well. She seems well respected. I'm sure she would make good decisions for everyone at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: She's the only candidate. Is she too CSU?

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: strategic planning, public/private partnerships, fund raising, established relationships with the BOG

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with faculty or research; only experience is in legal and operations

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Experienced in higher education including leading change initiatives and getting stuff done. Understands CSU culture and will be a collaborative and innovative leader.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Feels like a "safe" choice - Tony Frank Jr. However, the choice could be much, much worse. While Amy Parsons does not have traditional faculty experience, that does not mean she cannot lead a Research I institution. We should be aware of our own biases for who can serve in various roles in the institution.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Executive leadership experience at CSU, CSU systems office, and in the private sector.

Candidate Weaknesses: Very limited experience with teaching and research in academia.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Unable to assess her competitiveness with other candidates as she is the only finalist for the position.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: great administrative experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of agricultural experience, unsure of ability to connect rural Colorado communities to CSU

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Items for the Board of Governors, new president, and Interim President Rick Miranda to be aware of as we transition leadership:

1. CSU employees are frustrated that it is difficult to get approval “due to budgetary reasons” to backfill vacant positions with salaries of \$50,000 or less, and yet university leadership continues to create NEW positions to bloat the upper echelons of the organizational chart with six-figure salaries. The new president should examine if these titular promotions with pay and new supervisory structures best serve the efficiency of our organization.
2. The university needs a president that is not afraid of optics and is willing to make personnel decisions based on performance. The Office of Inclusive Excellence is hemorrhaging quality personnel and has lost 20+ full-time employees this last year. This is a huge red flag. Are exit interviews being conducted for OIE employees? Is there a plan in place through the President’s office or Human Resources or the Ombudsman to overhaul and improve OIE’s workplace culture? There is a re-org set to go in place January 1, 2023 at OIE that SDPS (Student Diversity Programs and Services) Directors and Coordinators in the division expressed considerable concern about the new reporting structure and their input was ignored and the plan is moving forward. I hope the new president prioritizes meet & greets with OIE/SDPS directors, coordinators, and partners to understand what needs to be improved at OIE and to determine a path moving forward. Our students and our staff deserve better. It would be an example of good leadership if President Miranda/the new president halts the January 1, 2023 OIE re-org plan and pauses on new hires until the new president can investigate.
3. With the recent soaring cost of construction, it is important to have a president familiar with balance sheets and project management to efficiently allocate university resources and be a good steward of taxpayer dollars and student funds. People are excited for the Clark remodel!
4. The hiring process at CSU takes too long and we miss out on hiring talent. It's great that HR recently began allowing positions to be fast-tracked. The new president should prioritize quicker searches, competitive pay, inclusive hiring practices, and affordable housing for employees. (The plan for affordable housing at Hughes Stadium is dead, but can CSU pivot beyond the land at Timberline Church to find other solutions to help attract and retain talent?)

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I was surprised to hear we chose someone who the students clearly did not want as their president. Also, I was surprised we chose another lawyer. That was clearly one of Joyce's struggles, using too much jargon and not connecting as a human.

Employee Classification: Faculty**Candidate Strengths:**

Candidate Weaknesses: 1. She is unprepared to engage and manage the diverse stakeholders of the university. Her public statements indicate little concern or understanding of faculty and staff needs. Furthermore, positioning experience as CEO of an "international" brand as somehow good preparation for becoming president of an enormous Land-grant institution is both laughably over-inflating the significance of her current position and completely misaligned with regards to the required skills and key audiences of a university. In other words, the shoppers of a luxury e-retailer are an infinitesimally narrow market compared to the diverse audiences, participants, and publics whose interests must be balanced by a university president. She has shown little capacity or care for engaging with these stakeholders beyond asking them to teach her how to do a job she is supposedly nationally competitive for.

2. Her experience with CSU revolves around urban planning and building projects that drain resources from the university's core missions of teaching, research, and engagement with the state's most underserved populations. The stadium and SPUR have yet to prove that they weren't massive misuses of funds that could have been better spent on retaining high quality faculty and staff through adequate pay and improving graduate student stipends. That these projects are touted as her unique qualifications for the job suggests again that she will be a president that does not listen to faculty or staff input or priorities. The stadium was--and is--unpopular. It is clear that Parsons and the selection committee do not see sincere engagement with shared governance as important to the operation of CSU.

3. This is an obvious case of cronyism and will be embarrassing to CSU, which is already entangled in two high-profile hiring disasters for which they are still paying millions of dollars. Parsons admitted in the faculty meeting that she was unprepared to understand NTT concerns. It is impossible that a national search was unable to turn up a single person with a holistic understanding of the university. Other institutions do it all the time. When asked about cronyism at the faculty meeting, Rick Miranda said he wouldn't engage the question. It's because there is no adequate answer. Not engaging the question because it is uncomfortable is an inappropriate and unconscionable response at a forum where faculty are ostensibly meant to weigh the candidate's merits and give their frank assessment. Especially in a period when lack of transparency and an insulated administration that acts at a remove from faculty, staff, and public oversight is leading to extremely low faculty morale that threatens the ongoing operation of the institution, choosing an inside hire and attempting to pass it off as a national search is not the way to build a stronger, thriving university community.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The hiring process for the president is a joke. Suggesting that people had multiple options for giving feedback as cover for this disaster of a hire obfuscates the chilling effect of the surveillance capacities of the feedback mechanisms offered for feedback. The announcement of a single finalist makes it crystal clear that the BoG does not value faculty feedback, especially when the candidate's announcement as president was scheduled prior to the faculty meeting primarily devoted to discussing her candidacy. Indeed, it was clear even when the search committee was announced--and had more business people on it than faculty--that the president would be chosen on their capacity to serve the business interests of private companies rather than the many, diverse publics of the state and the university. Beyond this, I have concerns about fiduciary propriety regarding the paying of an outside firm (Parker Executive Search) in this hiring process. Either a)

they are so ill-equipped for the commission that they couldn't locate a single candidate with some understanding of faculty issues or b) they are being paid to provide a smokescreen for cronyist hiring practices. Both options are misuses of taxpayer and student monies--and unfair to the staff and faculty through whose effort the university actually operates. Faculty morale at CSU is the lowest I've ever seen it. People are leaving. This is not helping.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The candidate is not qualified for the position of President of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate's experience does not equate to the vision and strategic understanding that a R1 university like CSU requires. While she has experience in operations and execution, she lacks a bona fide understanding of our mission and has no connection to stakeholders that execute on that mission. The failed Ripple Effect is one example. The salary equity debacle is another. Ironically these are listed as evidence of competence when the reality is quite the opposite.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The search process lacked rigor and transparency despite the intense post-selection marketing that is taking place. From the outset, this seemed to be the inevitable outcome. The facade of seeking input was disingenuous at best. It is insulting to have an unqualified candidate delivered for rubber-stamp approval as if the CSU community cannot see what is happening right in front of us. I am embarrassed for CSU.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: N/A

Candidate Weaknesses: Listing individual weaknesses is almost beside the point, as I do not see a single indication that Amy Parsons is remotely qualified for this job. Her main qualifications seem to be that she managed some of the pre-McConnell administration's pet projects (one of which, the stadium, is itself a massive debacle and an embarrassment to the university), and she's being rewarded thusly. This is called cronyism. Supposedly, there was a national search, but if this is the outcome, the "national" nature of the search was vastly overstated or the search committee abjectly failed at its job.

That the university hired someone with Parsons' experience of running a so-called "international e-commerce company" (really, just an online retailer for beauty products--a laughably inapt background for a university president and one that has been tellingly obscured in public comms about the hiring) illustrates a few things.

First, it reveals that CSU is further leaning into the corporatization and privatization of the university--one that, I will remind the administration, should be a public-facing and public-serving institution.

Second, it indicates that the administration has little to no interest in hiring someone who cares--or even knows much about--how the day-to-day realities of the university work. Every one of her public statements about the position and the university has been vague and insubstantial. This is a time when some of our most precarious workers--graduate students and non-tenure-track faculty in particular--are advocating for better living conditions. Hiring an inexperienced CEO whose rhetoric about the university is filled with platitudinous corporate-speak tells these members of our community that their concerns will be, at best, completely ignored or, even worse, that the administration is overtly antagonistic to their desires for a more humane workplace.

Finally, it is yet another example of the university not following through on the lip service it gives toward issues of social justice and equity. I have seen zero indication that she is invested in making this university a more welcome place for marginalized members.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Putting it bluntly, I have never had less trust in CSU as an institution that even remotely cares for the welfare of its students, staff, and faculty. Among other things, the presumptive hiring of Parsons is just the latest indication that the administration either does not know or does not care about the poor state of morale. If it's the former, hopefully some of these survey responses will enlighten them. But I fear it's the latter.

I will add that the almost total lack of representation from the College of Liberal Arts on the search committee is a notable (and sadly unsurprising) example of the university continuing to ignore a major campus constituency. As far as I can tell, the only CLA member on the board is

also an athletic administrator--a very telling detail. To me, this indicates that the board was constituted to shut down dissent and to ensure that our controversy-riven athletics department would be privileged on the committee.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I hope that this candidate will involve faculty stakeholders in their key academic appointment hires (i.e Provost).

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Not much compared to others who should be in this position. Even the work experience isn't much as related to this position. Take Dr. Miranda for example or President Frank before that.

Please ask yourself as a committee, What are these strengths and go back to the feedback that we provided earlier as what we want in a president.

Candidate Weaknesses: I have never seen a candidate that unqualified for a job of this magnitude. She might be extremely successful in her line of work as a "CEO" but this is a job that is extremely different and we really need a well qualified candidate who can take CSU forward and put us in a better position.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: How come we don't have any other finalist for this position. This really strange.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Very difficult to ascertain beyond here familiarity with CSU, which can be a drawback.

She has been part of several major CSU initiatives e.g., Todo Santos, and Spur campus, however, these sever the fringes of the institution.

Candidate Weaknesses: A history of poor collaboration, ineffective and/or outright failures regarding equity and inclusion. Decision-making that is centering herself. I was struck that she openly stated the only way she would come back to CSU was for the President's position. This concerns me highly regarding her motivations and what she truly seeks to achieve.

Minimal, experience regarding fundamental university needs: curriculum, faculty recruitment and retention, land grant necessities - building fail to achieve such, fiscal needs, student recruitment especially reflecting Colorado's trends.

Actual leadership experience is lacking, particularly problem-solving. CSU has significant repair needed for faculty and staff moral. We have lost numerous key administrators and numerous faculty are leaving. The lack of leadership for our educational mission, which includes how we expand knowledge production and processes, has been drastically absent.

Our financial needs are keen. She lacks the bridge-building and needed relationship building success that center education. She may have some in particular business spaces - cosmetics?

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: While there has been recognition and a type of patting ourselves on our backs for the 'number' of people engaged in this search, it has failed miserably when matching the needs from those participating in surveys and listening sessions.

This selection has been another blow to the possibilities and commitments of many faculty and staff. We merely are getting another person who lacks the dedication, proven record, perspectives, and skills to move CSU along in the dynamic and meaningful ways we yearn and know we can achieve.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Good sense for financials; history with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Not clear if she has a research background that is aligned with the research background of an R1 institution, but my hope is that her history with CSU will ensure she is aware and able to support that function (especially working with our VPR).

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Thanks for the hard work selecting a candidate!

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: fund raising potential, familiarity with the institution's upper administration

Candidate Weaknesses: She should not be offered the position as someone who has NO background in research and teaching. It will make a joke of this university as a R-1 institution. It's ridiculous to hire someone who leads an e-commerce company as president. That will make us look like Trump University of the R-1 world. In addition, her understanding of DEI/J will be close to zero. She doesn't represent 21st century leadership.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: This university has been so horrible for me as a woman of color and many others like me. This individual's nomination only confirms what we already know: CSU does not care about DEI/J and has no intention to change whatsoever.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: • Politically savvy and likely to be a good representative for the institution at the state level and with donors.

- Long-time friend of the current BoG and administration who has their trust.

Candidate Weaknesses: • No real leadership experience at any academic level within the institution, not as faculty, a chair, a dean, or even an associate dean.

- No experience with the research arm of the university.
- No formulated vision for where she would like to take the institution. A continuation of the Frank Doctrine may not be in our best interest.
- Reputation tarnished by significant involvement in several prior financial disasters (INTO, Stadium, Todos Santos) that have removed, and are still removing, funding from the academic and research missions of the institution.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: As a professor with over twenty years of experience at CSU, I find this selection the ultimate unfortunate extension of the nepotism and insider hiring practices that have bloated the size of our administration over the past decade. The university infrastructure is falling apart on many fronts, resulting in many non-academic units that may be headed by well qualified directors, but lack an experienced staff to get work done. Turnover of lower-level staff seems very high across the board, something that is likely driven by few resources and low salaries, and perhaps too many salaries due to new units and staff expansions that may be a luxury we cannot afford.

I also fear that Amy Parson's lack of experience on the academic side of our operation will lead to another round of administrative bloat as she hires staff to compensate for her own deficiencies in this arena. We do not need more administrators or resources for top-down management at this institution, we need resources for getting our core work done, fair and competitive salaries for both staff and higher education faculty, and fewer hurdles from an administration that seems hell bent on making lives more difficult by creating a bloated bureaucracy and regulatory framework in an atmosphere of limited resources where one must fight for everything.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She knows how to run a corporation, and bind us to exclusive contracts with money generating entities. Now that CSU is ditching any pretenses of being academically minded and making a full-scale assault on the unprofitable aspects of education (I mean, who needs Latin amirite?), she should be a great leader. Soon we will all be teaching business classes and be at the mercy of whatever political whims this administration wants. \$\$\$\$

Candidate Weaknesses: I was ok with Tony Frank as he at least knew what it was like to be faculty. I'm not sure that this candidate will have the empathy or understanding for those that she would oversee.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I mean, does the administration really care about what the faculty wants? In corporate jobs, there's no pretense that the CEO cares about the employees - what's maddening about academia is that there is an illusion that the administration values what it's highly educated workforce thinks...but, come on.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge and experience with Colorado & CSU, experience as a working professional and business-person, familiarity with CSU, loyalty to CSU. As a female, the candidate is a minority which is a strength.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of professional experience in academics/instruction/research. It is concerning that CSU is considering hiring a President who does not have the background to be able to understand the academic side of higher education. To hire a President who will make the most important decisions on behalf of all faculty, staff, and students, without ever having taught within higher education, is unsettling. It is also concerning that CSU is zeroing in on a President candidate who has such a close affiliation with CSU and has experience and a network with CSU employees already, instead of bringing in the most qualified candidate from the United States or world. There is a serious problem of hiring "inside" candidates and spouses within CSU as it does not represent a fair, objective search process and precludes CSU from bringing in top talent from around the globe. It is hard to believe that there are not candidates applying who have previous successful experience teaching and conducting research within a university. If you are determined to hire from within CSU, are there not any qualified candidates amongst the thousands of outstanding CSU faculty??

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: It is honestly upsetting to hear the Board of Governors determine Parsons as a finalist ready to hire next week, when faculty members have not been given more opportunity to provide input into this important decision.

It is even more upsetting after faculty members were not told ANYTHING about why we lost our last President. We are expected to remain loyal to the University and to continue churning away at our work. This makes me feel like a pion whose ideas, effort, and vision does not matter very much.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Amy Parsons understands the administrative side of CSU and has connections with Tony Frank and Rick Miranda

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons does not have faculty credentials and no research expertise. She has no real full time teaching experience. Her only real job experience has been at CSU. She was appointed to the positions she had above the general council job. Her close ties with Tony Frank and Rick Miranda makes it appear that she was picked by them and will do what they want. She will come into the position with a significant number of faculty believing she does not support faculty governance. By not being taken seriously as a leader Amy will have a hard time moving the university forward.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The perception is that this was not a search done in good faith in having faculty input. There was a large search committee, few faculty on the committee and the search done quickly. I would implore Faculty Council and the Board of Governors to NOT hire Amy Parsons. I hope that the other two candidates presented to the Board would be acceptable to the faculty (and other stakeholders as well). This is a problem that will get worse and won't go away. I hope the BOG cares enough about the future of CSU to do the right thing. Please, we are counting on you!!!!

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: It appears what the Board of Governors considers her strengths - business savvy, an understanding of the CSU System and its policies via the side of General Council and the administration of the System, are also what make many wary of her becoming the President. We are an academic institution that is state funded and for all. We are not a corporate enterprise.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons has no understanding of the academic side of the university. Her list of background strengths leaves out the very core of what we do - that is educate. Faculty-led initiatives, curriculum and faculty research are not within her scope.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: This whole process has led me to have very little confidence in the administration of the university. Amy Parsons appears to be hand-picked from within the system for reasons that I, as a faculty member, feel are flawed. We are NOT a large company - even though it seems like higher education is sadly moving that way. Bringing Ms. Parsons, without any academic background, in as our President will only move us closer to that very problematic corporate model.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has worked at CSU before. She is a friend of former President, Tony Frank.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has never held a faculty position. She has never held a college-level administrative position. She has never managed a large organization (her company has 5 employees and they made \$100K last year, a relatively small budget for a company). Her application materials do not demonstrate a deep, rich understanding of CSU's current commitment to DEI. All of the initiatives she claimed to spearhead were all designed and run by others. I am not convinced that she understands the experiences of women faculty members or administrators at CSU. The Ripple Effect was a flop and did not result in anything helpful until Cori Wong was hired.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I am deeply concerned that this was the best candidate that applied for this position. Why are the other candidate names not being shared - if the BoG and the university is trying to get CSU back on track after our past president, they should start with a greater level of transparency. I am embarrassed, saddened, and shocked that other high-level university administrators from other universities (presidents, provosts, vice presidents, deans) did not apply for this position! What does this say about CSU?? Are we really that insular that we only have internal (because Amy Parsons has barely left CSU) candidate?

As someone whose three degrees (2 in agriculture and 1 in life science) and work experiences have all been at Land Grant Universities, I am shocked that this is the candidate who is supposed to lead us to a higher status.

I am also saddened that the testimonials about the search process were included in the email and presented as though the search committee members were endorsing the selection of Amy Parsons. Instead, these individuals were simply commenting on the process UNTIL the last stage when the university and BoG appear to have lost any commitment to transparency.

Looking through the alumni magazines that my family members and I receive and then seeing what CSU is becoming, I realize that we will never be an international name. We will remain a regional university, albeit a strong one, with a few outstanding researchers and departments. That's it. Amy Parsons will keep us in this position. I was hoping for a happier new year.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The candidate is already familiar with CSU administration and many administrative processes. She was involved in several large-scale developments within the CSU System during her previous tenure at CSU.

The candidate likely has strong ties to university donors and other significant stakeholders.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate has no experience as a faculty member, researcher, or educator - which are part of the driving mission at CSU. As such, she does not understand how people in these positions must work to balance their teaching, research, service to the university, and service outside the university. Consequently, she will have no insight into the complete lack of work-life balance inherent in holding these positions at CSU.

Her business background is relatively recent and has nothing to do with higher education.

She is too entrenched in the current and past CSU administration and will offer little innovation at or elevation of CSU.

Several of the initiatives she led in her past roles at CSU were controversial at best and harmful at worst.

The candidate has done little in trying to solve issues of DEI at CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I have difficulty believing that out of all the candidates for the university president, Ms. Parsons was the absolute best choice. If that is true, we may need to rethink who we are as a university. Bringing Ms. Parsons back as university president will lead to a lack of innovation and new ideas. As I was told many, many years ago as a graduate student, "We like to bring in faculty who did not do their graduate work at this university to help bring in new ideas and keep us innovating. Otherwise, we become an echo chamber." There is a very real danger of this with Ms. Parsons.

Ms. Parsons also appears to need more experience in DEI matters. CSU has real problems at all levels concerning DEI, and I do not have any faith that Ms. Parsons will be able to address these issues.

I also would like clarification about how this process, which was supposed to be transparent, has become so closed. There was no discussion about any other finalists for this position nor why those finalists were not more appropriate for the position of CSU President.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Previous administrative experiences at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: My primary concerns is that this candidate does not have any academic experience as a faculty. As a higher education institute, academics is the foundational component at CSU. I am skeptical about relying on the vision and practice facilitated by someone who does not deeply understand our daily operations, such as balancing teaching, research and service. From mentoring students to teaching large courses, I cant imagine how this candidate would even begin to understand the dynamics and interactions between faculty and students.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Having a single finalist is NOT a healthy hiring process. This is unacceptable.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She once worked at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not understand the experiences of a faculty member, since she has never held a faculty position, moved into a department or college level leadership role, and has never conducted research as an academic.

She has a very superficial understanding of issues related to diversity and inclusion.

She does not appear to have realistic or innovative visions for how to make CSU a more globally important university, how to increase our very modest endowment, how to be more transparent, how to actually determine how to move us towards becoming an HSI while ensuring that students can graduate on time and be successful in getting jobs, and how to improve our Alumni services.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I am frankly surprised that the search committee and BoG did not disclose the names of other finalists. It makes the whole process seem secretive and like an "old boys club."

I hope the BoG and the search committee are concerned if the best candidate for this position was Amy Parsons - who has very little experience understanding the lives of students, faculty members, college and department level administrators. They should be deeply concerned that other university presidents and administrators didn't apply (or maybe they did and it is more important that someone is from Wyoming (a mountain state) rather than what they accomplished professionally. I am positive that other Land Grant university presidents will be looking at CSU and scratching their heads.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons does not have the academic leadership experience that makes her capable of effectively leading an R1 research university like CSU. Moreover, her lack of research and teaching experience is a severe shortcoming that will make it hard for her to understand what faculty do. We do not want a President who views us as possibly dispensable service providers, and cannot understand what scholarship means.

This is reflected in her cover letter, which lacks a vision for developing CSU further as a world class research and teaching university.

Ms Parsons previous work experience at CSU shows that she is a capable administrator of large construction projects, not an administrator of a research university. Arguably, every project that she was in charge of implementing is a while elephant. It is beyond dispute that none of these projects contribute to the core mission of CSU, which are teaching and research.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Despite the many statements attesting to the integrity of the search process, I am a little baffled as to how, after ousting the previous president just as she unveiled her strategic plan for the university, the Board picked a member of the inner cabinet of our previous President as the best finalist for the next President. The optics of this look terrible, and will affect CSU's reputation.

In Faculty Council Dr Rick Miranda effectively argued that we should give her the benefit of doubt. But do we hire a professor of English to the physics department because she may just turn out to be good in physics? We'll never know till we try, right?

Dr Miranda also argued that there is a growing trend of hiring non-academic presidents. This may be true overall. But Presidents of all comparable peer institutions are either accomplished academics, academic leaders or accomplished public figures. Ms Parsons does not fall into any of these categories.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She seems to be well liked by CSU upper administration. Has some prior association with the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: It is not at all clear what her qualifications are. Is it that she was a CEO of a cosmetic company with 5 employees that made \$100K? That seems like a joke. Does she know what it takes to run a university (and not run it into the ground)? What understanding does she have of what faculty do? what students need? staff needs?

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Who are the other finalists? If this was the only one, why wasn't this declared a failed search? I was shocked to read the Source article with the faculty representative to the B.o.G. going on about what a fair process the search has been. Doesn't seem like a fair, open, or transparent process to me...

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: none

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience - SAHE was co-taught and she wasn't the lead instructor. And, she was a direct hire for every job at CSU - can we say nepotism?!

No true business experiences - the time she was away from CSU was minimal and the company is not up to par with what Rick shared in terms of Perdue's past President (who by the way was not a good President) or the senator who is now in Florida. Rick also shared that ""we"" had to ""help"" Amy to learn how to be a President and it surprises me that the search firm, Parker, wasn't able to find someone who had experience given that their last selection of Joyce was a complete disaster. Faculty by the way, were not asked to ""help"" Joyce - nor should we be asked.

Lastly, Amy is not a good leader - it's her way or the highway and she doesn't like problems. She's not an advocate of diversity and so all these DEI initiatives that have been circling around will be a complete waste of time. If we lost faculty with Joyce, get ready because more people will leave CSU under her lack of leadership.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Why go with the same search firm that chose Joyce as a candidate?

Why not do reference checks with people who had actually worked with Amy directly while here at CSU?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: No strength for a University president position. Her only strength is that she is a puppet for Tony and Rick.

Candidate Weaknesses: A University president must show excellence. This person achieved nothing in her life. She is neither a successful lawyer, nor a successful entrepreneur (please do not cite that dumb e-commerce company which miserably failed). As VP operations she colluded with Tony to waste taxpayer's money. Meanwhile, the University ranking kept plummeting every year.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Faculty council - please do not yield to Rick Miranda and Tony Frank. You know very well that Amy Parsons does not deserve to be a president. Her only role will be to work as a puppet for those two misogynist old males. If you have minimal amount of spine left, question them why Joyce McConnell had to leave. Why the taxpayer money will be wasted to hire a president, fire her with a huge compensation and do another round of million dollar drama to hire a random person from the street? This is happening while the students are in huge debt, grad students are not earning the minimal wage, University prestige is plummeting drastically. Have some shame and speak up - that is why you have the tenure for. The students and faculty deserve to know why Joyce had to leave. You call Purdue, NCSU, TAMU, UIUC your peer institutions. Seriously? Do you have any idea about their prestige vs ours? Actually you know. All you lack is the spine to speak up. You are brilliant academics and you deserve better. Get a scholar who is super successful as a dean in a top University. That person should be our president.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate lacks experience with teaching and research, as well as with the majority of CSU's fields/areas of study. If we had a law school, perhaps she would make more sense.

She would not be a competitive candidate for a leadership position in our peer institutions – why is CSU settling for less?

To me, this is academic inbreeding – quite unbelievable that it is happening at this level. Concerning in terms of DEI and for many other reasons.

There has been a lack of transparency beginning with Joyce McConnell's departure. Certainly there is a time and place for discretion, but it has reached a point of calling into question the institution's ethics. This is not how we should be modeling decision-making for our students.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Thank you for gathering this information and considering the feedback.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Complete lack of research experience and understanding of life and agricultural science

Limited teaching experience.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She is familiar with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has not been a faculty member or worked at CSU in a role that will help her understand faculty or student issues.

She is part of the old guard (she worked under Tony and Rick), which means we will be going backwards. Under the past administration, more women and people of color were tapped for higher level administrative roles. Will that happen under her watch given it didn't happen the last time she was here?

CSU has great potential, but it will never be realized if we don't get someone we can be innovative instead just maintaining the status quo and implementing whatever Tony wants.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Why isn't there more than one finalist?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Deep executive level institutional knowledge and experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: None.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Amy Parsons is a wonderful candidate. Many successful university presidents come from outside academics.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: History with CSU - but her role and rapid rise to administration was always somewhat curious.

Candidate Weaknesses: Little to no experience in teaching and research. Very curious rise to leadership in the CSU system, then leaving for a random unrelated CEO role, then the SOLE finalist for a national search at a large R1 university. It all seems very fishy and planned and like there was very little transparency of the process to land on this ONE candidate that Tony Frank took under his wing years ago, and which seems to be continuing.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I believe the CSU community deserves to see multiple candidates with more related experience and that sessions should have been publicly hosted on-campus. This was supposedly a very in-depth search with a huge search committee and I have to assume there were other more qualified candidates... What happened??? This leaves lots of questions about what happened to our previous president and what's going on with this search for a new president. There's very much a feeling that these two things are linked and not above board.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Past history with CSU, knowledge of the CSU system, especially from a legal, financial, and possibly political perspective.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate has never been an academic or a faculty member. This could indicate a possible future disconnect between this president and major issues facing educators in higher ed at CSU and researchers at a Carnegie Research 1 level institution who are at CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Is there a reason why candidates with expertise in law keep getting chosen? This kind of makes it look (on the outside, with no insider information) like CSU needs that for some reason.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Unfortunately, her only strengths are her weaknesses. Her strengths are simply her experience at CSU, particularly under Tony Frank, but when she is the ONLY finalist, this mostly appears as cronyism. Had she been one of a few diverse candidates, this would have been better received. Furthermore, her other strengths are only aligned with fundraising and the corporatization of academia, which is not a universally applauded or desired direction for this university according to many if not most faculty.

Candidate Weaknesses: That she is a "sole finalist" is incredibly problematic and her strengths do not match the overwhelmingly clear demands that came through in the "listening sessions," specifically supporting staff, fair and equitable compensation, transparency of administration, issues of equity on campus, etc.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The Board of Governors seems to do whatever it wants to do without faculty support. This is just one more example of a long history of soliciting opinions and then ignoring them. The reports from the listening sessions were quite clear about the desired characteristics and prioritized challenges on this campus, and Amy Parsons does not represent those in the slightest.

She represents a direction that I daresay most faculty do not approve--the corporatization of the academy.

Furthermore, this choice appears to demonstrate Tony Frank's refusal to let go of CSU, and allow it to progress, as well as the Board of Governors refusal to stand up to him. Sadly, the way this has been conducted means it's practically inevitable that she will appear as a puppet to Tony Frank and is already stepping into the role with half of the faculty feeling a sense of "no confidence."

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knows about university operations
friend of the chancellor

Candidate Weaknesses: knows nothing about undergraduate teaching
knows nothing about graduate education.

knows nothing about research

doesn't have a PhD

never mentored a graduate student

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I am completely disheartened and disillusioned by the process of providing one finalist and that this is the specific finalist. The statement that this candidate was by far the best in the pool means one of two things: (1) CSU is so undervalued that nobody competent respects the institution enough to apply or (2) the process was completely flawed. Neither of these is acceptable.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: This candidate has no personal experience in research or teaching at the university level (the case has not been made to the CSU community that this approach is valuable); This candidate may be considered as an "inside hire" which is worrisome that voices outside of this "inner leadership circle" will be silenced

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Promotion of CSU around the state, national and international levels.

Candidate Weaknesses: Parsons has minimal experience with neither teaching/learning nor research which are the pinnacles of what happens here at CSU for both students and faculty. With her dominant experience within the sector of business, neoliberal perspectives of competition and marketization of learning and research may be prioritized for students, faculty, departments and colleges over the core principles of learning, knowledge production and experience making. Further, Parsons' long history with CSU as a student, administrator and a parent prevents new perspectives and new ways of thinking about the institution, its purposes and its functions.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Some knowledge of certain aspects of the university

Candidate Weaknesses: Not a qualified candidate, especially compared to so many worthy others

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: It does not seem like this candidate was chosen through a legitimate and credible process. She is frankly an embarrassing choice that degrades the integrity of our university. The only reason I can see her being chosen is because a small group of shortsighted, priveledged and powerful people bracketed their minority values as being most important. Unfortunately, this shortsightedness ignores our university mission and is bound to fail. I foresee a tumultuous administration that will end in having to find an actually qualified candidate. I fear this experiment will result in falling short of many of our stated goals, especially around hiring and retaining faculty, and damage our reputation for years to come.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: I don't feel I have access to much information about Parsons, however, I'm concerned that DEIJ is not at the forefront of the discussion she is bringing to the table. CSU has so much work to do to engage in anti-racist and anti-oppression - I have seen no information about Parsons' support for DEIJ efforts, engagement with DEIJ on a personal level, or focus on DEIJ advancement at the University.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Practical leadership in business and university settings.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Leadership for a university often need people with good business experience, not necessarily academic experience. There needs to be an understanding of the role and freedom of the faculty, but the university is much larger than just the classroom. The athletics, research, and outreach are also important.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: 1. Operational knowledge of the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: 1. Does not hold an academic doctorate.

2. Does not have experience in teaching.

3. Does not have experience in research or other scholarly academic activity.

4. Has not held a higher academic office at a peer institution.

5. Has not articulated a clear vision based on her academic experience for transformative leadership of Colorado State University.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The proposed single finalist (Amy Parsons) does not have the demonstrated academic background or history of academic leadership necessary to be considered as president of Colorado State University. These concerns include lack of an academic doctorate, lack of experience in teaching, lack experience in research or other scholarly academic activity and not having held a higher academic office at a peer institution. Moreover, the candidate has not articulated a clear vision based on her academic experience for transformative leadership of Colorado State University. As such, other candidates should be forwarded for consideration of the faculty and campus community.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate does not have any experience as a faculty member at any university. This is a major weakness in terms of understanding the faculty perspective at CSU. CSU currently has critical problems with hiring and retaining strong faculty members, and this candidate is not equipped to address these issues.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has experience as CSU administrator

Candidate Weaknesses: Has very little experience with faculty or student experience.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: This nomination of a long-time CSU system insider, following on the heels of the abrupt removal of the former top leadership of the university, will in my view likely have a strongly negative effect on faculty morale and faith in the higher administration's commitment to strengthening the university's commitment to positive social change within the institution and in the communities it serves. It undermines the necessary autonomy (not independence) the university should have vis a vis the CSU system. I fear it will lead to an exodus of significant faculty and administrator talent and discourage and weaken the institution's ability to recruit new colleagues.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Seems to be well liked by CSU administration. Has prior experience at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: It is not at all clear what her qualifications are. A CEO of a cosmetic company with 5 employees that made \$100K? That seems like a joke. Does she know how to run a university? What understanding does she have of what faculty do? What students need?

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Why wasn't Joseph Garcia selected as a finalist? At least he has prior relevant experience as a president of CSU Pueblo and Pikes Peak Community College. During his tenure at CSU Pueblo, its enrollment grew and became The Outstanding Member Institution by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. Not to mention he was Lt Governor.

Where was our faculty representative to the Board of Governors? This does not seem like a fair or transparent search.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knows the administrative side of the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: '- seems to have no experience with research, grant writing, getting research published

- very little experience with teaching
- very little experience with extension
- no name recognition outside and inside the state, other than at CSU
- not qualified to be the president of a research-tier-one university

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I am assuming many others have chimed in and gave their opinions. If the nomination of Amy Parsons has already achieved one thing, then it is that it brings the faculty together. I have seen faculty members that usually do not agree on anything suddenly being unified in their skepticism about Ms. Parsons' qualifications.

I believe that Dr. Frank, the members of the Board and the members of the search committee are all highly intelligent people who have the best interests of Colorado State University in mind. That is why I am so puzzled by this choice. Why offer this important job to somebody who has so little experience preparing her for it?

When Dr. Miranda pointed out that he had little experience each time he moved up, from chair in his department to chair elsewhere, from chair to dean, from dean to provost, from provost to interim president, he, probably involuntarily, made the case for the faculty who are skeptical of Ms. Parsons' qualifications--that's the way you learn the ins and outs of an university, one step at a time, not all steps at once. Yes, there are academic outsiders as presidents at some of our peer institutions, but they are well-known across the country, because they were high-ranked politicians or extremely successful businessmen and -women. Ms. Parsons is neither.

The looks of this choice are odd--embarrassing to the outside, insulting to the inside. Again, then, why did such talented people with good intentions agreed on this choice?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: CSU connection.

Candidate Weaknesses: Ms. Parsons never served as an academic-- this seems like a non-starter. Also, her time spent in the cosmetics business wasn't particularly aspirational or inspiring.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: None

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic record. This is embarrassing for CSU. I have never heard such masses of negative comments about a presidential candidate. This candidate has no experience in what it takes to be in this position. It is quite sad that this has been "pushed through" and a huge black mark on CSU's record to be in this position.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I have never heard such masses of negative comments about a presidential candidate. This candidate has no experience in what it takes to be in this position. Apparently she was 3rd on the list of candidates and the other two were quite talented sitting university presidents. It is quite sad that this has been "pushed through" and a huge black mark on CSU's record to be in this position. The Faculty Council and the Board of Governors needs to do the right thing and walk this back - for the sake of our reputation and what is best for CSU's future.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Long experience at CSU. Great record in executive positions.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience. Little to no knowledge about teaching, research. Application materials present no vision for the university and the goals for the future.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: This candidate has a long history as a subordinate of Dr. Frank. Will she exercise independent judgment when needed?

This seems another step towards running CSU as a business. CSU is a land grant university, not a business.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: A long history with CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: Has always worked on the administrative side of academic and in director/administrative positions. Given this reality it is hard to see how the candidate understands or will understand the concerns and the difficulties that faculty face with regards to resources for teaching.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: It is hard to see how the candidate understands or will understand the concerns and the difficulties that faculty face with regards to resources for teaching. The candidate also does not seem to be concerned with the equitable treatment of faculty from different colleges within the university. There are colleges which are considered generators of income from outside sources who are privileged with more resources and higher salaries (vis-a-vis peer institutions), yet they not teach the most. While faculty from colleges that do more of the teaching are perceived as 'less worthy' of receiving equitable salaries (vis-a-vis peer institutions). Given the candidates reputation and track record from when they worked in legal at CSU, it is hard to see how they have any empathy for the faculty in the colleges perceived as 'less worthy'.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

She has developed a relationship with CSU and was at one time a student here.

Candidate Weaknesses: I would much prefer to have a President emerge from the currently existing CSU community. Preferably this would come from the academic side of the governance structure. Clearly this candidate is being forwarded for consideration based upon her ability to cultivate non-academic relationships outside CSU

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I would rather have someone better suited to recognize issues related with the internal working of CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: has some familiarity with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: will potentially run CSU like a "business", which is exactly the wrong way to run an educational institution, ESPECIALLY an R1.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: You should be much more transparent, and actually bring in multiple candidates to let the university comment on each one, just like we do with Deans, Faculty, admins, janitors, etc. This smacks of a pre-ordained pick with no debate.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Heavy handed in directness when leading employees creates low trust and a lack of transparency and respect.

Prior employment feedback leaves no room for creative flexibility in what is in the best interest of the university. Her mind is already made up.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: No academic experience to readily lead faculty and a land grant institution; this should be a requirement to ensure the success of the university during turbulent times.

Hiring a new President that faculty are prepared to take a vote of no confidence is real and will not help retain or recruit faculty, who are the heartbeat of the university.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Parsons has had numerous ties to CSU and appears to be passionate about the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate seems to have mostly upper level administrative experience and very experience with faculty and students. I am also concerned that her close ties to Tony Frank may make her a mouthpiece for the Board of Governors.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The search committee should have had much greater faculty and student representation. We are the heart and soul of the university but only a very small portion of the decision makers. Also, why didn't candidates come to campus and hold in-person sessions for everyone? We don't even know who the other candidates were or what their qualifications might be. There is no basis of comparison for Amy Parsons. Perhaps she is the best candidate but without knowing about all the candidates, we will never know. The university is much more open in its hiring of a new director for TILT than for the new university president! After the lack of transparency around the firing President McConnell (somewhat understandable), I would think the university would make an extra effort to be truly transparent in the hiring of the next president.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU, good legal acumen, strong local relationships

Candidate Weaknesses: Absolutely no experience as an executive leader at any level in higher ed. Based on my time as an exec leader at another institution, legal counsel work does not prepare a person to lead in this role.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Absolutely shameful that we would not be presented with more than one finalist to consider. Hold yourself to the same stringent standards that AP and faculty search committees abide by.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Close connections to current administration - lacks diversity of ideas

Poor performance in prior position at CSU

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I observed poor choices and management when she was previously at CSU. I was not impressed and do not consider her a strong leader.

She is too close to current administration. We need diverse leadership.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She worked at CSU and has administrative experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has no experience in teaching and research. She has the mentality of a CEO, which means more neoliberal policies, and therefore, more inequalities and inequities.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: This search has been faulty. It lacked transparency and representation. As a NTT, I do not believe Amy Parsons will fight to improve the working conditions of CSU faculty. I also think she doesn't represent the change of culture this university needs.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU and the CSU system; close ties to CSU Chancellor

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience as a faculty member or instructor; close ties to current CSU administration

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: no research experience or experience with faculty that perform research

no evidence of understanding of academics or research

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: It is unbelievable that the Board is considering someone with no research experience or experience with faculty that perform research for the office of President of CSU. This candidate can be a great administrator and well known by members of the board, but this does not even come close to being qualified for the job in an R1 university. Please don't ask me to have any respect for or listen to anything she will have to say about academic and research. Last time the choice was someone from a far inferior R1, now is someone without an understanding of what R1 even means. Good luck getting the respect of any faculty member!

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Strong track record of leadership experience in business and law.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lacks academic training and experience

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I strongly feel that Tony Frank is still the effective leader of CSU. While Dr. Frank continues to serve as Chancellor of the CSU system, I do not think any CSU president will be provided with the support and trust to enact any new vision or priorities for the institution. While I feel that Amy Parsons has an impressive resume as a strong leader, she continues this path of maintaining the status quo for the institution. However, I also feel that it would be unfair to any candidate who was not effectively 'internal' in terms of experience working with Dr. Frank to serve as CSU's president. Dr. Frank needs to move on and allow the next generation to move CSU forward.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

I have noticed a dramatic difference in how we make hires at CSU.

First: the faculty. My department has made incredible hires over the past few decades. The search is international, credentials are impressive, the process is open, and the finalists face a grueling several days of interactions with faculty, students, and staff, all of whom bring different perspectives to the search process. This level of refinement in evaluating personnel has been a spectacular success. Our young faculty are absolutely outstanding. I truly cannot believe how good they are.

Now, the President. By far, the most successful presidents at CSU over the past 40 years were Albert Yates and Tony Frank. Both gentlemen were accomplished academics and underwent a crucible of evaluation similar to that used for faculty. This model no longer exists. The search has been off-loaded to a “search firm”, the candidates never run the gauntlet of full campus interaction, and the “finalist” is selected in an absolutely bizarre process that mimics some sort of twisted arranged marriage. The individuals who have devoted their lives and careers to CSU are never brought into the decision-making until it is almost too late, presented with a potential President whose impressive legal and entrepreneurial credentials are outweighed by a staggering deficit of academic heft and are left wondering, to use a phrase I have picked up from our students, “WTF?”.

But things are even worse than they appear. Without question, the worst President in CSU’s modern history was Joyce McConnell. I truly cannot believe how bad she was. Professor McConnell was selected using the exact same process that is being used in the present search. Rather than using some introspection and adjusting Presidential searches after exploring what went wrong, those in power inexplicably went back to the same disastrous well. Anyone involved in her selection should never have been allowed near the search process this time. Are we that obtuse? Have we learned nothing?

Rick Miranda is the archetype of the solid and competent Interim President. Start the search over. And for heaven’s sake, this time do it right.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knows the system

Candidate Weaknesses: not an academic. is a stooge for the T. Frank regime

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: what about someone fresh and new, or does that rattle T. Frank's grip on the CSU system?

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Lack of transparency during the process was unsettling. It seems like faculty should have a better idea of what happened with the previous president and more influence on the search for a new one.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

(received as a .pdf file by email:

Notes on Presidential Candidate: to Sharon A. per request to SOE

Kudos to FC for asking for input, will also be responding to the survey.

1. Think the messaging on the process have been enlightening, until it became secretive per narrowing the pool. And not revealing the 3 finalists. We do not have a basis of comparison
2. Concerned the candidate has been part of the 'previous good ol' boys network—for too long and that some of them will be advising her.
3. Her interviews and the reporting of them do have the 'right' higher education words/phrases, but is that what reality will be. What is missing from them? Faculty, academics and programs, etc.
4. Have mixed feeling about extent of usual academic record and experiences—our colleagues should be heard on this.
5. Think we are handicapped not knowing why President McConnell was asked to leave.
6. Candidate does fulfill the CSU voices of summer 2022 speaking to 'know Colorado' but that can be 'in a rut' and as a colleague indicated earlier 'ruts can become fur lined and very comfortable' What risks will our President be willing to take to advance excellence, the principles of community, and CSU's uniqueness.
7. One risk that is essential is a 'new budget model' we have lived with and been oppressed by the one that has been used for years.

Do I endorse her as our next President—No.

Employee Classification: Other (explain) Faculty and administration

Candidate Strengths: From the information shared from her interviews and from the background shared:

She has deep experience in CSU administration from her time as VP of Operations. This includes her experience working with central administration and understanding the inner workings of the university.

It is small, but that she has a child enrolled at CSU is a plus.

She has deep business experience, something that will likely be helpful as she runs CSU - a very large business.

From her interviews, her comments about listening, respect, collaboration and positive leadership give me optimism about the job she would do.

She is female - which is a strength, since our first female president was just fired.

Candidate Weaknesses: It is hard to definitively say what her weaknesses are. These can't really be determined having not done the job yet.

While she doesn't have a PhD or teaching experience, I don't see this necessarily as a negative. If she listens to the faculty and knows the mission of the school, this **should** be irrelevant.

Perhaps the only perceived weakness is a lack of central administration experience in academic areas. The reliance on her team must be paramount. But as a faculty member who has moved into administration, I deeply understand the issue of lack of "experience" that must be learned on the job. It can be done, and done well, if her personality embraces teamwork, learning, listening and communicating. From her interviews, it appears that that is the case.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The BOG needs to understand the climate in which they have named the next president:

You fired our last president in the summer, creating a leadership vacuum across university leadership positions. (Provost, Dean of Grad School, VPUA, HR, etc.) There was no transparency in regards to that decision. (It's important to note that President McConnell was our first female president that was widely liked and respected. That hit hard.)

You named a search committee but did not have transparency with that process other than asking us what we wanted to see in a new president.

You named a finalist but gave us no point of comparison to the other finalists. (This is really important to understand as the push back you are experiencing is related to a vacuum of information)

You should not be surprised that the faculty and staff are upset and questioning your decision. Perhaps even posting a job description of their day to day work would help you make your case about your choice.

While I am generally optimistic about the choice of Amy Parsons, you have chosen a non-traditional candidate with very different skill sets than a typical university president. You must do a better job of talking us through how her strengths match our needs right now.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain)

Candidate Strengths: Ms. Parsons is highly qualified to run a private business. She has clearly been involved in several CSU business ventures - stadium, spur, INTO, under the direction of Dr. Frank. The success of these ventures is questionable, however, with regard to return on investment to the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate has never held an academic appointment. This is not to say that only a PhD could run the university, rather that Ms. Parsons lacks the knowledge, experience, and demonstrated desire to navigate successfully the interplay between acquiring and managing funds and infrastructure, and managing the people who keep a LAND GRANT, STATE university running. The shell of CSU infrastructure, buildings are essential to university function, but the core principles of CSU are at stake and frankly, are suffering greatly. She has no concept of what it takes to write a grant AND teach multiple courses AND review/edit journal articles AND manage student mental health, with ever-dwindling resources. These are essential duties of many CSU employees, not just faculty. There is also no indication that Ms. Parsons has experience or commitment to fostering inclusive excellence. She has never held a position, at CSU or otherwise, that entailed managing large groups of individuals with diverse backgrounds and job descriptions. She has been groomed to do the bidding of Dr. Frank and has not demonstrated commitment to the core mission and values of a LAND GRANT university.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: CSU is in desperate need of a leader who can help it rise to its mission of 'setting the standard for public research universities in teaching, research, service and extension for the benefit of the citizens of Colorado, the United States and the world.' Building (and outsourcing) fancy buildings, then moving on to a private import business doesn't demonstrate a commitment to these values. Extension is all but gutted, except to serve the requests of big agriculture, who have frankly bought and paid for their seat at the CSU table - enabled by Ms. Parsons and Dr. Frank. Ms. Parson's appointment is in clear alignment with this agenda.

By all accounts, the search advisory committee did their due diligence and felt they raised the top candidates to the Board. The fact that numerous testimonials were requested and supplied by committee members to attest that the process was fair and transparent screams that by all other counts the search was NOT fair and transparent where it really mattered. There is no indication that other candidates were even considered. The lack of communication about Dr. McConnel's departure and the summary firing of all of her appointees, with replacement by those who are in Dr. Frank's close ranks (the nicest way I can say this) is also a glaring demonstration that Ms. Parson's appointment was to further this agenda.. How did the university start the '22-23 academic year with record enrollment and a \$3.2M grant to the Provost and Academic Affairs if the president and her cabinet were doing such a poor job? The surveys were thinly-veiled attempts at transparency for a search that, by all other impressions was a foregone conclusion. Given the lack of support for this candidate, it would be irresponsible for the Board to continue with this appointment. No incoming president will be the answer to all of the needs of this wounded institution, but they do need the confidence of the majority of the employees. Though it's not the goal of this survey, I would posit that the real reform the Board should consider is the

removal of Tony Frank. He has puppeteer-ed CSU to a disastrous precipice and is ready to add the final straw by engineering the hire of Amy Parsons.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain)

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU over long-term with several important aspects

Candidate Weaknesses: No research background

No teaching background

No mentoring background in a university setting

No extension/outreach background

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Inability of faculty to comment and play larger role in selection on such a position is ridiculous.

She has certainly done some important things, but her resume is not that of a University president--think Al Yates or Tony Frank.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain) Research Scientist II (AP) and Adjunct Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I am not particularly familiar with Amy Parsons. I appreciate that her long term knowledge and investment in CSU, and experiences that range from having been a student herself, to now being a parent, mean that she has deep knowledge of certain perspectives of CSU. However, I am concerned by her lack of knowledge of academia beyond Colorado, and that her deep connections to CSU may also lead to entrenchment of systemic problems.

Employee Classification: Other (explain) Part time instructor

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU and experience with its operational and financial systems

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic/scholarly credentials

Insider candidate who has not made decisions, but only implemented actions

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The selection of Amy Parsons by the CSU System Board of Governors to be the next President of CSU is very problematic and totally unacceptable for several different and important reasons.

First and foremost, is the profound appearance of favoritism and “nepotism” and the lack of transparency with regards to Chancellor and former CSU President Tony Frank’s close association with Ms. Parsons over some thirteen years at both the CSU-Fort Collins and CSU System-Denver campuses. It is difficult to imagine, that after a comprehensive national search, Ms. Parsons would be one of three final candidates, and ultimately the sole candidate for President, without considerable support and undue influence by Chancellor Frank and his inner circle of administrators. From her C.V. and cover letter it is clear that Ms. Parsons was routinely “appointed” to significant positions of leadership and responsibility within CSU and the CSU System without competition, and thus became a loyal insider and “right hand person” to the decisions and deliberations of the CSU Administration, many of which were contested by the faculty and the public, over the period of more than a decade. Taken in the context of the recent and premature decision to remove former President Joyce McConnell from her position, and then subsequently to appoint a clear insider like Ms. Parsons, who has far less academic and higher education credentials, to President borders on the absurd. While it was made clear from the beginning of the search process that there was a desire to select someone who “knew Colorado and CSU”, Ms. Parson’s familiarity with the institution does not in of itself warrant her selection.

Secondly, Ms. Parsons has no credentials in her C.V. or evidence in her cover letter that she understands the academic mission of the University, in any level of detail, that would position her to be successful in the role of President of a major research and land-grant institution. While she may seek to surround herself with others who are knowledgeable in that regard, she will need the support, gravitas and awareness to work with hundreds of tenured faculty, researchers and administrative professionals engaged in the actual internal and external work and mission of the University. While the University is certainly a business/non-profit enterprise requiring many skill sets, these essential and core academic/research functions are quite distinct and different from the attendant “operational” and “administrative” aspects of the University where she has demonstrated competence and familiarity.

Ms. Parsons is clearly articulate in pronouncing her passion for CSU and her willingness to collaborate with faculty and researchers and other internal and external stakeholders. She is correct in that she has led or been the force behind many operational and infrastructure actions at the University over the past two decades. However, she undertook all of these actions, not as a decision maker, but rather as an operative at the behest of key leaders in the Administration. This perspective and these associations compromise her independence and integrity as a decision maker and President.

The appointment of Amy Parsons to the CSU Presidency is not a transformational decision. Rather, it is a decision that maintains the status quo, protects the insider influences that have

shaped CSU over the past decade or more, and refutes the possibilities offered by a fresh leader from outside the current structure who has significant academic gravitas. Ultimately, her selection fails to excite and have the support of the essential workforce within the University who are looking for a transformational leader, and not an operational manager of CSU's systems.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Business administration. Fundraising. Connected to Fort Collins & Northern Colorado elites. Focus on athletics. Attracting wealthy families & students.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not enough focus on academics & professors. Not enough focus on continually growing inequities between employee compensation & local cost of living. Myself for example: I bring home just over \$2,200 a month & am trying to survive & afford housing in Fort Collins. Without a significant raise in the next year, I will be forced to move somewhere else & give up my 14 year long life in Fort Collins. The current pay scale makes it nearly impossible for most state classified employees to ever afford to buy a house in this state. Both of these concerns are shared by almost every employee & the mentions by Amy on these topics have been quick, few & far between, & not well thought out. I like to give people the benefit of the doubt, but it's obvious when someone says something because they feel like they have to, rather than because they believe it. I sincerely believe that Amy Parsons will continue to drive a wedge between the common people of this community & the wealthy elites she hopes to continue to attract & keep close. I see inequity gaps accelerating at an all time rate with her in charge.

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: It's greatly disappointing that there is one "finalist" for this important role. The process has been designed by you so that your predetermined candidate can get the job without a challenge. I find it hard to believe that a thorough search could only turn up one suitable candidate. This university has major issues to address & no one seems to care. Saying you care isn't good enough. Where is the action? Where are the cuts to outrageous salaries in order to promote equality in underpaid positions. The money is there, but it only gets spent on shiny things & "elite" people. Leadership needs to be concerned with everyone at the university & in the community, not just the people who make us look good to the elites. CSU is pretty & glitzy enough. We need someone to get back to basics to help the common people who make this university work. At the current rate of accelerating inequities, the problem of attracting & retaining quality staff at CSU will only get worse. I wanted to build a career here & it's become apparent that a career here is impossible for me if I want to live anywhere near where I work.

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: She is CSU! Knows our mission and what it means to be a land grant university.

People may say she doesn't come from administration or education but look at what we got with Joyce. Quite honestly the last 3 years were a disaster.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Good Choice.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Wealth of knowledge of the CSU system. Lots of experience in the field of academics. Dealt with several different entities to accommodate plans and details of large scale projects

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: Her background of all her work over the years speaks volumes. She is obviously motivated and hard working

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: been at different roles with the University

Candidate Weaknesses: unsure

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The State Classified personnel needs to have wages reviews as the cost of living increase has not kept up with inflation or the wages of the private sector. I don't feel that any president has cared about this or wants to address this as they view it as a State issue, however they should have some ability to give an across the board increase to help with the stagnant wages we have had.

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Business Knowledge & fund raising abilities.

Candidate Weaknesses: Continuation of the “ Cult of Frank”

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: The University needs a clear & clean break from the past that has led to the mistrust and indifference, which the university leadership has caused in the community and with its own staff!

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors: I think her experience with the CSU system is a tremendous asset. She was over the department that I work in when she was the VP of operations and I thought she was a wonderful leader and felt that she truly cared about making things better for everyone.

Employee Classification:

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification:

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification:

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification:

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification:

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council Leadership or the Board of Governors:

