

Employee Survey on President finalist Amy Parsons
December 11, 2022

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.

By noon Saturday the survey had received 766 opens from 344 faculty, of these 249 Administrative Professionals, 305 faculty, 46 State Classified and 19 ‘other’ submitted text to at least one of the three questions.

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

Administrative Professional responses	page 2
Faculty responses	page 254
‘Other’ responses	page 570
State Classified responses	page 591

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Business experience

CSU Experience

Candidate Weaknesses: I don't know - I know very little of her.

I can see some on campus having concerns of her lack of academic/faculty background.

I don't mind her lack of academic experience (and it is likely because of my background) - and it is very untraditional for a college President to not have this background. I also am open to a new model (vs. what has existed since the early 1900's) as I don't think the skills needed for this role come from someone who has academic experience. I think there are far more skills needed that can be attained in many ways. And I think if the process was more transparent and we were open to moving away from the traditional academic background (and why) this could have been helpful for those that are tied to it. I think some of the histories with these pieces are tied to privilege and elitism which is good for us to challenge.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The search did not seem very transparent. It started very transparently. When it was shared that we would have a new President by December 2022 in early Fall/late summer, I was surprised as most universities take a year to search for their next President. Based on the recent information, it seems a possible plan was already in mind, which I actually think our leaders need to have. I just wish we could have learned more about the other candidates that were interviewed/considered or that the process didn't exist if a replacement plan was already identified. We could have used the 500k used for the search in so many ways on campus (employee wages/critical building failures, etc). I often worry about CSU's financial stability and the lack of investment in our staff wages and buildings. With the payout of our last President, a couple of football coaches, and the cost of a maybe not-necessary search, it is my hope we have learned how critical to make good hiring decisions for CSU and that the cries for funding for our staff wages and building failures are taken more seriously as CSU seems to have funding depending on who needs it/requests it. We also need to spend money on technology infrastructure (our purchasing/payroll/timekeeping systems are a mess) vs. hearing ""that cost a 1M"" - who is going to fund it? The efficiencies these systems have the possibility of saving on the number of staff needed (which are harder to find in Northern CO for what we pay). Our systems require so much human intervention which also then has human errors and creates more work for the corrections. CSU has neglected these key items for too long and I am hoping someone with business experience can help us get to the 21st century on many of these items (people, processes/systems and buildings). Coming from another R1 university I am embarrassed about how far behind we are on these items. I also hope we can learn how to make things happen faster. We need this to stay competitive with other businesses. Amazon will be adding 1000 jobs to our area - what are we doing to retain our current employees and compete with these Amazon jobs before it is too late? Many of these Amazon positions will start at \$19 an hour. We still have full time SC staff starting at \$15.66 While many times institutions of

higher education are known to be slow to implement change, CSU is even slower, other campuses have found ways to get it done (AP Compensation study was started over 10 years ago, procurement barriers are unreal, etc.)

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Upon receiving the news that Amy Parsons was named the finalist for the role of CSU President, I was disappointed on many levels, but not surprised.

I had heard this predication many months ago from individuals in university leadership. Given the NDA-protected departure of President McConnell, the demotion of Provost Mary Pederson, the appointment of Rick Miranda as Interim President, and the strategic firing of Vice Presidents, all with whom I spoke conveyed this prediction with a sense of resignation rather than hopeful excitement. The picture of a cabinet, college leadership, a university leadership team, and special appointments set in place in accordance with the agenda of the Chancellor will now be complete. Those with legitimate credentials for leading an academic institution, and who had disparate ideas and strategies, have been removed.

Many existing leaders fear losing their jobs if they voice objection; no one has dared to demand accountability. Remarkably, though the elephant was in the room, not a single Faculty Council member questioned Interim President Miranda during the first Faculty Council meeting of the Fall 2022 semester regarding these critical leadership changes. Even more remarkably, Interim President Miranda did not believe it appropriate or necessary to brief this group of faculty leaders unprompted.

A reliable source stated that an individual on the search committee shared in August that there would be a December announcement regarding Amy Parson's appointment as President. Even if this is not true, the number of people who predicted this outcome lends credibility to the idea that communications soliciting feedback related to the president search were in fact illusions of choice. Most firmly believe that the decision had been made long ago, and that President McConnell's departure was simply a step in achieving this goal. Perhaps a step made sooner than anticipated, but a strategic step nonetheless.

Further evidence of a not-so-hidden agenda, and the knowledge that Amy Parsons could not possibly have risen as the most qualified candidate given the pool consisting of current university presidents and other highly qualified academicians, is the excessive amount of accolades and justification presented as part of the announcement. The phrase "the lady doth protest too much" comes to mind.

In the recent past, I have observed that the recommendations of stakeholders and search committees have little bearing on who is ultimately chosen for college and university posts. The

hard work of those individuals is usurped, and the process hijacked, if the recommendations do not align with the Chancellor's vision. I have also observed that some individuals recently placed into leadership positions lack qualifications. In this case, I believe that both phenomena have occurred.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU and CSU System from various angles and perspectives, as an alumna, employee (various levels), and as a parent.

Strong business acumen. Running a large public land-grant university has many parallels to running a large company with global reach. We should not discount her background in law and administration as those are talents that will be useful in navigating the business of higher education over the next decade and beyond.

Candidate Weaknesses: It would be nice if she had more first-hand knowledge in the classroom and with research but I would not go so far as to call that a weakness.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Honestly, there are very few faculty and researchers who are well suited for administrative roles in their own departments and colleges, let alone running a large public university. Fortunately, there are a select few who have the proper interpersonal skills and business acumen to be effective as administrators and I appreciate when those individuals step up. I was not part of the search, but have been part of many, many searches at CSU over my 20 years. It is critical in hiring, especially at this level that the major skillsets are in place to lead the organization and build a team that fills in the gaps and compliments leadership. Although it would be nice if Amy had more teaching/research experience, that is not at the top of my list of what is needed in a university president. There are many professions at this institution and they are all equally important in serving our mission, which is to educate students. We need to remember, without students, there is no university. I don't expect the President to have experience doing my job or that of my unit. I do expect the Provost to have a strong academic and research background and that is what FC should be focusing on with the new president to ensure we put the right person in that role. If the president doesn't have classroom/lab experience, so what? It is our job as professionals to step into advisory roles and bring her up-to-speed and provide her with the research to be informed. At the end of the day, even if she had research experience, it wouldn't be in every realm of research that takes place at CSU. I'm married to a research faculty member and have numerous friends who are research faculty and they couldn't tell me what goes on outside there building most of the time. Don't put too much weight on something that ultimately has very little impact on whether she's qualified to run the business of a large research university.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Deep history with, and understanding of CSU.

Clear track record of results on projects led by her.

Candidate Weaknesses: Historic deep-seated questions about her commitment to Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Social Justice. Very concerning in the current landscape of higher education, and for our most vulnerable student populations. I would like to hear her philosophy around these topics addressed in a meaningful way.

No faculty background. Even as a non-faculty member of the university staff, I can see the problematic nature of having a university president with no faculty background. How much damage will this do to her ability to be successful in this role?

The rumor mill is churning about how/why she was identified for this role. Whether true or not, it is damaging to her ability to be successful. The sexism will be rampant, and I've heard from multiple people that her relationship with Tony Frank is the only reason she will be our next president. This is disappointing, and will hamper the respect she should garner as president of the institution. Again, whether true or not, these rumors are rampant, and I think they will have to be publicly addressed in order to set her up for success. As a woman, it's so disappointing to hear the immediate narrative of "'the only reason she got this job....'" Due to this history, I don't think she will be set up for success.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I believe there needs to be transparent, authentic, public acknowledgement of two things, at minimum: 1) Her commitment to DEI - what is her philosophy, how does she see that impacting the access mission of CSU, and will she support work that centers equity and inclusion? These are massive questions that remain unanswered. 2) Her relationship with Tony Frank and their deep history needs to be publicly acknowledged and transparently discussed. When there are gaps in information, people fill in the gaps with their own stories, and that is creating a toxic university response to this hire out of the gate.

I have no personal knowledge of this person, and no idea whether the stories that are circulating about her hire are true; I do know that she is currently not being set up for success, and political spin and dodging of digging in to these questions authentically will immediately position many factions of the campus against her, whether warranted or not. This is my fear. I think she could likely be a fantastic university president if some of these things are dealt with quickly and authentically.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: The conflict between the Fort Collins campus and the System/Board was problematic and harmful. I sense that was the single biggest challenge of the prior administration, meaning the single most important qualification was to install a new president who will erase that gulf. Problem solved with Amy Parsons. The board and Chancellor are getting exactly what they feel they need most. Amy has other qualifications, but that's all window dressing. Being trusted by the system and board is the only qualification that matters.

Candidate Weaknesses: Her single biggest weakness is that she is well known, and neither well respected nor well liked. I'm sure the Chancellor and board appreciate all she accomplished, but they live in a bubble. Her approach to implementing big things came at a cost. She struggles with cooperation and team building, she doesn't listen well, she has selfish tendencies, and she lacks empathy. Clearly, on day one she will be a controversial president with a target on her back. The board and system are all choosing to invite significant turmoil for the Fort Collins campus, just for the benefit of hiring a familiar face.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I write this with the Board in mind. Naming Amy as president is a controversial choice. However I am optimistic that she can be successful, but only if she is able to evolve as a leader. She can no longer be Tony's get-things-done agent. Instead she would need to treat CSU like her own family. She needs to hire or promote great people. Surround herself with a team with complementary strengths. Empower her leadership team and trust they will be successful. Listen more. Emphasize empathy. Welcome internal disagreements that advance institutional goals. Incentivize change, don't demand it. Don't blindly assume others are incompetent or combative, especially when they simply disagree. Amy was part of a CSU senior leadership team that had difficulty listening to the counsel of outsiders, probably because they got tired of the conflicting opinions. Unfortunately that leadership choice led to several missteps, and ultimately to the deluge of feedback you are getting about Amy now. If she can demonstrate a different approach to leadership in this new role, she can be a transformational president. If the board or system staff or even Amy see a comment like this and write it off as ill informed or blasphemous, then I expect Amy will be unsuccessful. Please help Amy be a successful leader for CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy seems like an excellent candidate by way of administration and leading a multi-million dollar organization. This experience would be helpful to her in this position. I also saw her make a couple nods to positioning her privilege and naming Indigenous communities.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy does not have a base in research, which may a steep learning curve when leading an institution as research-heavy as CSU. Her experience also lacks faculty experience, which may negatively impact faculty here on campus. I also hoped to learn more about her approach to leadership as it pertains to staff at her previous company. Not information that she was a CEO, but if and how she used her positionality to forward needs and support of her staff.

Additionally, I did not see Amy really name marginalized identities aside from Indigenous people, or outline a solid plan to support these affiliates. I see a white woman presidential candidate who lacks an intersectional perspective on the heels of another white woman president who lacks an intersectional perspective; and that president caused a great deal of harm to marginalized people on CSU's campus. I feel like this hire could re-traumatize people still reeling from their experiences under the former president.

I did not see Amy speak much about repairing (or attempting to repair) the harm caused by the previous administration, or even acknowledge the harm and pain that exists for faculty and staff at CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts, and I'm left wondering if they really matter. It reads as if the decision has already been made in the same way decisions are made in my own unit: unilateral, top-down decisions without the input from the broader community, with feedback being gathered as an afterthought. I am also considering that the outcome may be similar to what I see in my unit, as well, which is feedback being met with negativity and the previously made decision being put forth anyway.

I see and understand that there was a large and diverse hiring committee, which is wonderful. And, this survey could have been sent when this candidate was being considered instead of already chosen, which would help faculty and staff feel like they were part of the process and had a say in the decision-making process. Again, this just feels like lip service.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU. Special relationship with Tony Frank and close connection to CSU system inner workings/politics/people. AKA - the mob boss mentality will continue to rule.

Candidate Weaknesses: This is the weakest presidential candidate I could imagine. It is unheard of that being an alum, parent, and donor to the institution - and a "FOT" (friend of Tony) is all that is really necessary to lead the institution. Yes, she has a lot of previous experience working at CSU, but she was never vetted in those positions! She was consistently hired and promoted without a search and rose to prominence and power in the same way this process has played out. Her tech company is a joke and she has obviously been jockeying for this position the entire time. Her major accomplishments for CSU = making Tony Frank look good without any substance or sustainability.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The institution's leadership in the past 6 months have been a disaster. The community was told that the university was "off the rails" and needed to be righted but what that seemed to really mean was that Tony and the "old boy" network wasn't getting its way without a puppet for president. All metrics for university success were sky high, despite a pandemic! Record enrollment, donations, research dollars and community satisfaction = why didn't the Board care about any of these data?! Because these people were not truly part of the "Ramily" and they brought new ideas, energy, and perspectives. The sledgehammer was dropped and a lot of good leaders were removed and demoted without any discussion or opportunity to "right" the train simply because they didn't realize the real way to be successful was to be quiet, be ineffective, and make Tony look good. This place is used to being led by fear and trauma and an entire workforce (especially women who don't get to thrive or have their voices heard unless they are puppets or vacuous do-nothings) is scared, demoralized, and definitely not inspired to help the university thrive. CSU will continue to be a joke across the state and nationwide with Tony Frank at the helm and this Board doing whatever he wants without questioning his motives, the impact for thousands of employees, and the future of the institution.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU and the CSU system administration. Understanding of State of Colorado political system. Connections with external stakeholders in Colorado

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of demonstrated experience with leading DEI initiatives and Culture Building, none. The issues inherited by the recent president were created (and not dealt with) on the prior administration's watch and Amy had key responsibilities in these areas. Why would recycling past leadership result in different outcomes in these areas?

Lack of demonstrated success in leading administrative processes at CSU.

Finance, HR, Budget has been largely inefficient and ineffective for years including during the time Amy was responsible for these functions.

Lack of experience in the Academic and Research missions of the University.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is hard to see how this hire will be viewed and anything other than a strong chancellor installing a weak president that can be controlled from Denver. Make no mistake about it, this perception will impact this finalist's ability to lead given the impression that a puppet president is being installed by a micromanaging chancellor.

While a CSU administrator this candidate was largely ineffective in leading in administrative areas relating to the finance, budget, human resources areas under her leadership and these processes were neither efficient nor effective.

In addition, there has been zero leadership in the DEI area by either the System office or during the time this candidate was a CSU Vice President. Why would the BOG settle for more of the same ineffective leadership?

I would encourage the BOG to review DEI leadership experience of this candidate to determine if there is substantive experience in this area. All the buzzwords have been dropped, where are the details of actual leadership in this area.

This finalist was effective in leading the operational implementation of system level capital projects. However, there was a serious lack of transparency with these projects including toro santos, the stadium and spur. This track record of failure to be transparent to University stakeholders is extremely concerning.

Why would the same old leadership result in a different result?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy is very polished and, generally, presents well with internal and external groups. She seems to connect well with people in a public setting. Based on my experience, she was a hard worker.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has no academic experience.

From my perspective, she makes a good impression on supervisors and other people of importance. However, this does not necessarily translate to the employees in less influential roles. On more than one occasion, I have personally witnessed her take credit for other people's ideas and hard work without attribution. She is an expert at self-promotion, which may or may not serve the best interests of the university. In her early years as VPUO, she took numerous trips. While I believe she enjoyed the travel, public-facing events, and connecting with CSU partners, her interest in the day-to-day responsibilities of her position waned. Also, based on my observations, if she has a disagreement with someone else, she uses the tools of her position to diminish the other person's role or importance. She is a bridge burner and not a bridge builder. While I recognize that I am speaking in generalities, giving specific examples may compromise my identity or the identity of others. I did work with Ms. Parsons when she was on campus and am speaking based on my personal experience and observations.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: From my perspective, the announcement of Ms. Parsons as the finalist for the highest job at CSU is troubling. The red flags are abundant. This campus endured three years of chaos during Joyce McConnell's presidency. During Interim President Miranda's short time in the role, we've been able to get back to the business of the university. It is my hope that whoever is appointed will continue in that vein. Based on my experience, however, that is not Amy Parsons.

While Ms. Parsons no doubt has a number of supporters, I hope it is clear that there are many people who have known and worked with her that have serious concerns about her ability to lead at the presidential level. The decision that the Board of Governors will make has serious consequences for CSU, its students, and employees. We cannot afford another tumultuous presidency.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Parsons was part of the pay equity process that was conducted a few years ago. In a moment where pay disparity is front of mind for many employees at CSU, this is probably a good thing.

Candidate Weaknesses: Parsons has no apparent faculty or academic administrative experience. This is a huge blind spot in her eligibility for the role. For an institution that takes pride in its research focus and grant funded programs, not having first-hand experience of that is concerning, and may result in faculty and research staff not getting the support they need.

I am concerned that Parsons' current role as a CEO will shade her leadership, and increasingly make CSU a commodified experience, one based not on academics and education, and instead on creating ""experiences"" for students. In a moment where a college education grows increasingly inaccessible to more and more students, a move like this may alienate our prospective students.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: For all of the language of transparency we heard from campus leadership about this process, I feel like this was rushed through without input from key stakeholders like faculty and employees. I find it discouraging that a recruiting consultancy was hired for this process, and a candidate internal to the CSU System was selected anyway. How was that money spent?

Similarly, the lack of transparency surrounding Joyce McConnell's departure has created a sense of mistrust in University and CSU System leadership. It's hard not to feel like Parsons was selected by the System's leadership and not for the CSU Fort Collins community.

I am also concerned that Parsons' closeness to previous CSU presidents means that these individuals will have an undue influence on her time as President at CSU. In many ways, the University is at an inflection point, and there is a distinct need for change. This appointment feels like more of the same, and while that may work for some programs, it doesn't work for many others.

I do not feel that this decision is beneficial for CSU, its faculty, staff, students and the Fort Collins community as a whole.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Entrepreneur. Familiarity with CSU operations and budget. Obviously close with the Chancellor

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy is not qualified to be the president of an R1 institution like CSU. Her previous experience in higher ed is limited to operational and financial matters and she has no experience with academics or research. It is an embarrassment to CSU to put a leader in place who is so woefully unqualified for the job. It is also so obvious (and therefore embarrassing and demoralizing) that Tony wants to put someone in the president's position who does only what Tony wants - a puppet. It is not fair to Amy to prop her up as the de facto Tony. After the experience with Joyce, Amy is obviously a "safe" choice as she will never do anything Tony doesn't want done.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy has a well-known reputation on campus of being impulsive, arrogant, flippant, and extremely difficult to work with. Talk to any number of people who worked directly for Amy while she was at CSU or the system - she demeans her direct reports, plays favorites, and has no patience for any detail, even if that detail is critical to being able to accomplish what she wants. She has chosen to pursue or fund initiatives that benefit her or her family personally, even if they're not a priority for CSU. She is untrustworthy, and has outright lied about decisions made. She is very "top-down" and not a collaborative leader at all, placing more value on just getting something done quickly rather than soliciting crucial feedback from stakeholders and those with more expertise.

If Amy becomes president, CSU will be distracted by all the drama that will accompany a bad choice for this role. We won't be able to make progress on important initiatives as staff and especially faculty will be focused on trying to get her removed, or trying to find ways to continue to do their good work without being micromanaged by an incompetent leader.

There is so much potential harm if Amy becomes president - surely there must be other options? CSU is a great university. Can't we get someone great to run it?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am new to CSU and have little context for making claims about Ms. Parsons' qualifications beyond what we were provided in SOURCE and other news outlets. But I have worked at other campuses and have been through 4-5 presidential searches. I was also present at the Faculty Council meeting this week and heard the comments. From what I have learned about Ms. Parsons, I would say that I am hopeful about her future here. The president is the chief executive officer of the institution, and not the chief academic officer--that is the provost's role. In these times, the president of a large public university needs to have political acumen, vision for the institution, and the ability to support the fundraising goals of the institution, among other things. The president should support and defend the mission of the institution and be savvy about handling attacks on that mission and the people who work daily to further our goals. That Ms. Parsons has played a role in some of the more innovative outreach programs for the state is exciting to me. As the land-grant university, CSU plays a crucial role in helping our people to thrive. As president, we hope that she will show respect for the students, staff, and faculty while she collaboratively creates a vision for our future. All of this in an ever-changing and often scary political environment that is hostile to higher education. Those are the metrics we need to use to view Ms. Parsons' candidacy, and not whether she has an academic background. I have been through many academic hoops myself, and I cannot say that defending a dissertation, publishing papers, or trying to get promoted have built in me any of the competencies needed to manage a large university in a politically-charged environment. It is well-documented that universities are struggling to find good leadership. There are good reasons to question any candidate, but I have yet to hear a reasonable argument against Ms. Parsons.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: '-Amy is familiar with CSU in various facets such as alumna, staff member, and donor.

-Amy is familiar with the inner workings of the university having previously worked here.

Candidate Weaknesses: After thorough research I am disappointed to see that this is the sole candidate for such an important position on our campus. Having been here for more than a decade I have seen the impact the past two presidents have had on our campus. In a Q&A released by university communications Amy fails to mention strategies to advocate and champion causes for historically excluded students and community members including staff. While the university mentions increasing the number of members from these communities it fails to retain them by hiring presidents that do not serve as advocates.

In her interview Amy also mentions Lincoln's land-grant mission to provide access to education through strategy. While this is important she fails to mention the problematic relationship between this land grant mission and who it was originated to benefit and the cost of the indigenous populations AND the exclusion of BIPOC populations to this educational system for DECADES. While the recognition aspect might not seem pivotal it speaks volumes about what the candidate holds important and NOT important and how it might play out if she becomes president.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: While I know search committees are some of the most un-glamorous and long aspects of our positions I ask that you seriously consider a candidate that does not have complete higher education experience. While she might seem the person for this position in the moment it is important to note our institution will change - we are slated to become a Hispanic Serving Institution within the next decade. We must have a person that is willing to grow, adapt, and advocate with this change rather than embody traditionalist values that have held us back.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Part of leadership in the past at CSU. Has a political and law background. Seems to have very close ties with Tony Frank- for good or bad. Led the first comprehensive salary equity survey to uncover and remedy gender-based inequities;

Candidate Weaknesses: Does not have a background with research or teaching (except a little - teaching). Knows one side of the CSU community/ enterprise. Seems to have very close ties with Tony Frank- for good or bad. Worked under candidate in the past and didn't really feel supported and didn't feel like funding and opportunities were available, but that may have been the department dynamic? Didn't feel like the two VPs were collaborative at the time and seemed very segregated between the two VPs. No experience outside of Colorado system- how to make it better.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I'm sure you have heard the concerns others have had in regards to the interviewing and candidate process and how the decision was made. Seemed to skip a step. Also APC was invited to the table and our executive chair left CSU for another position and we were not invited back (the Co-chair wasn't invited to take the Chairs place). We were left out of the process. Seemed to move very quickly all of the sudden and all of the publicity of ""support"" seems like the leadership is trying to downplay something. If I didn't think something was fishy, I do now. Also very secretive in regards to the previous president and CSU's ""mutual departure"". I feel there is a lack of transparency. Did the 31 person committee get to decide or was the decision made and they were told that it was made? I have read the support from some of the Advisory Search Committee members and appreciate the quotes. I do wonder though, how much ""advising"" they were able to give in the process and decision.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Parsons seems very familiar with CSU, having served in many positions in support of University leadership in the past. I see past work on gender pay equity at CSU in her resume, which speaks well of her. It sounds as if she has a history of handling high-profile, large-budget projects (Spur, for example).

Candidate Weaknesses: I reviewed the history of CSU presidents over the past 100 years or so, and I found that most past presidents have been academics, typically with research and departmental administration experience before being elevated to the presidency. I understand that Parsons taught graduate level courses in student affairs, but the description of that segment of her experience in the announcement of her finalist status was quite vague. The apparent lack of academic and research background in her CV does not inspire confidence in the wisdom of this choice; I'd rather see a candidate whose core competencies match the core mission of the university.

Her recent background as head of a small, online-only, Italian-themed beauty retailer is bizarre and underwhelming for an incoming president of a large research university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: If I were imagining a perfect candidate for this position, it would be somebody with academic and research experience, with administrative experience, and with experience in leadership at a public university. Parsons checks some, but not all, of these boxes. I'm willing to believe that she could serve well in this role - to give her a chance - but I'm not *confident* in her selection.

I think the announcement of a single ""finalist"" is awkward at best, and a violation of the spirit of the search process at worst. But the proof will be in the success or failure of her presidency, if she takes office.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Seems to have a strong passion for supporting CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate has zero faculty experience, nor has a PhD, which is a big red flag for me for any presidential candidates. Supporting this nomination follows a dangerous precedent that is growing nationwide of bringing on presidents who do not have faculty experience, and those presidents seem to fail big and fail hard very quickly. My alma mater hired one of these presidents and they designed in disgrace less than 2 years later; that candidate did not have faculty, student, or alumni support, so it felt horrible to have so many years as an alumni wasted. I don't want to see CSU go through the same.

A successful candidate does need to have research and teaching experience. As a Carnegie doctoral research institution, research is one of the largest impacts on our productivity as an institution and affects so much of faculty, graduate student, and postdoctoral researcher life. This candidate would not have any understanding of this endeavor and thus would be at an extreme disadvantage.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is extremely disappointing that open town hall sessions with finalists for the presidential appointment were not held with faculty, staff, and students prior to a finalist being named.

Town hall sessions and feedback with all constituents are a cornerstone toward a democratic and open hiring process.

The Board of Governors needs to include these types of sessions and transparency with all candidates, or you will likely start to be censured by national organizations as well as lose faculty and staff. This incident has shaken my faith in the entire leadership of CSU and may largely impact where I decide to take my skills, research, and dedication.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Longstanding connection to CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Significant lack of demonstrated experience pushing for equity and inclusion. I am really nervous about having another JD as a president, because the lens is about liability and assets, and not about students/teaching/research/supporting students and staff. This feels like a huge miss. Given that the institution has spent the last 3-5 years alienating our Student Diversity Programs and Services offices into a division with 'leadership' that has demonstrated time and again a lack of care or concern for the student experience, advocating on a systemic level, or making the necessary difficult decisions to move inclusion and justice efforts forward, this nomination feels like more of the same.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: As an AP staff member working directly with students and whose role is focused on advocating for individual students and for systemic change, Parsons is not it, as the youths say. Based on the experience she brings, she will not push the envelope, she won't take risks in the spirit of making CSU a more inclusive and justice-oriented institution, and she will focus on strategies that limit liabilities (e.g., she is a capitalist and I hate that). During the last 5 years, staff and student voices have become very unimportant in decision-making. Please, please take the feedback you receive from people around campus and truly consider whether she is the right choice. What will she possibly move forward? What positive difference is she poised to make at CSU? How does she really, REALLY embody the Principles of Community, which have become as one student said, a nice picture on the wall. Please find someone who lives and breathes our values.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: '- Knowledge of CSU as an alumni, a parent and a staff member

- Worked on Spur and the campus stadium, she knows how to fundraise
- She knows the CSU system, very small learning curve
- Has taught graduate coursework
- Has ran a business before so will likely run CSU like a business

Candidate Weaknesses: '- No weaknesses observed but we didn't get to really participate in the interview so i'm not sure what her weaknesses are.

- There are serious issues though that we have at CSU that I hope both faculty council AND the new president can work to address. For example, there is no requirement for any DEI work to be completed as part of the tenure process for faculty. There is no required training for new faculty regarding DEI. Both of these are issues that both you all and Parsons should work on.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: '- There's a lot of concerns coming from faculty about Parsons not having any faculty experience and I feel like this concern has been largely overblown. Now please do not hear this as me saying faculty are not important. But I think this concern is a misunderstanding of what the modern day college president's role is. The president is a political fundraiser, someone who can meet with a variety of constituents and represent the brand well. Furthermore there is a built in position in University leadership to represent the needs of faculty, the academic provost. Now if the newly selected provost has no faculty experience, that's a concern. But Amy being familiar with CSU and being connected to many people, she will appoint a strong provost.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: past experience with CSU Fort Collins campus and CSU System office, all administrative in nature. Some outreach experience via Spur campus program development. Town and Gown experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: little to no academic or research experience - core missions of CSU; shared governance decision-making is relevant to this role, including the communications process related to shared governance. How will this finalist manage their lack of experience? Who will manage the finalist's performance to ensure awareness of these weakness is addressed and feedback is provided? My concern, based on President McConnell's tenure, is that a culture of intimidation and suppression of feedback/ideas may continue if not addressed upfront in an honest and deliberate manner.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: how will CSU System ensure this candidate's weakness (or opportunities for improvement) be managed? I observed, though from a distance and relying on conversations with past VPs and Deans that President McConnell could have done a much better job with both shared governance and communications. The past three years under this culture of poor shared governance and communications has been extremely stressful on the campus community. My last comment is that the new President will need to rebuild the Provost and Cabinet roles, bringing onboard team players and then be willing to delegate and empower the Provost and Cabinet. We must learn from the last three years where decision making was left largely to three individuals (President McConnell, her Chief of Staff and CFO).

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Reputation for being very smart. Strong foundation with budget. Multi-decade commitment to CSU. Proven track record of bringing initiatives across the finish line.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of academic background or rising through faculty ranks. Lack of focus on students or student success, in a meaningful way, in application materials. Has not presented herself in application materials as a leader to move us forward on race/ethnicity elements of DEIJ.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I'm actually confident Amy will be a strong president for CSU. She has much to learn but any new president would have their own learning curves. I have concerns with the PROCESS.

The Chancellor and BOG set up a process that removed transparency. I understand candidates are less likely to apply for a position at this level if it's public when they aren't hired. But isn't that part of the risk/reward proposition? And isn't it true for all of us?

It's widely discussed that Tony encouraged Amy to apply. It is known they are very close and that he promoted her many times. BOG members (who made the hiring decision) are on the search committee. People Amy used to mentor are on the search committee!!! It's just not a good look and leaves a lot to be questioned. If it had been an open search, Amy would have likely risen to the top...and had engagements with the campus community that would have earned allies and supporters rather than critics.

Please change the process for next time around. In the meantime, I'll work hard to make sure my new president is successful.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy has many years of experience with CSU so she understands our history and our culture.

Candidate Weaknesses: I have not worked with Amy since she moved to the system office in 2015, so I acknowledge that she may have grown in her leadership skills since then. My concerns when I worked with her previously is that she seemed very driven by opportunities that gave her a public audience, personal travel opportunities, and personal benefits over what was actually best for CSU. I also had concerns about how she treated her staff - she would take credit for their work, and she was dismissive of their perspectives. It also appeared to me that she only wanted to collaborate with others when it supported initiatives from which she would personally benefit, rather than collaborating on initiatives that were best for the university regardless of the impact on her and her personal benefit. I also found that she was dismissive of diversity and inclusion efforts and had challenges listening to, and validating, the perspectives of others when their life experiences were different from hers.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: As an attorney Amy is able to make a very positive impression when she is in front of groups, but I'm concerned about what she says about herself versus the lived experience of those who have worked for and worked with her in the past.

As a positive, she is a known entity to many of us so we had a sense of how to work with her, which would not be the case with someone unknown to all of us.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Fundraising

Knows the university and its funding structure

Great statewide relationships

Will represent us well with external audiences

Track record of hiring good people and trusting them to do their jobs

Loves the university

Strong experience building partnerships and finding creative funding strategies

Strong alumni relationships

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of faculty support

Appears to have alienated some people on campus in the past, but I can't tell how much of this is that she worked on the stadium versus who she is.

(I don't consider the lack of an academic background a weakness since she is not being hired as a faculty member. I read the survey results from the search committee and many people said they were open to someone from an alternative background who had the skills needed to be president. I think this person does).

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I have no problem at all with this person as president. We really need a good administrator to bring some organization back to the administrative side of the house and cut back on the number of AVPs and directors that have proliferated the last three years. There is a lot of bloat with a simultaneous reduction in effectiveness and accountability. Rick Miranda has started to address that, thankfully. We also need someone who is really good at fundraising and understands enrollment. What I care about are administrative effectiveness and getting CSU's budget to a decent place so that we can make progress on salaries.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: As referenced by the borderline obnoxious Q/A article in the Source, she clearly ""loves"" CSU and has experience at the university, albeit from an operations perspective only.

Candidate Weaknesses: Faculty and staff are very intelligent and clearly know this was a political move by our boy Tony. Perhaps I'm judging too quickly and she will turn out to be a terrific and inspiring leader, but all signs are pointing to a puppet President.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: First and foremost, this 14-day Colorado law is garbage and we barely know anything about her. Maybe a little more transparency into the process next time (e.g. who are the other candidates?).

Best case, Amy is a fervent, passionate leader for CSU who actively listens to faculty and staff to propel CSU to new heights in the midst of a wild political climate, both on a national and state level.

Meh but OK case, she is purely a horn for Tony and shakes hands with all of big wigs while staying out of our way and allowing us to keep pushing things forward on the ground level without interference.

Worst case, her ""growing e-commerce expertise with Italian handmade goods"" with a social media presence of 8,000 (WOAH!) provides her with the expert knowledge and understanding of all things at CSU and she decided to unilaterally mess with everything that we do... setting CSU back years versus similar institutions of higher education.

So curious to hear what Faculty Council thinks about all of this.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU, cares deeply about CSU, held many roles internal and adjacent to Fort Collins campus, operations background, higher education leadership background, charismatic, diligent, authentic, advocate, the list goes on.

The very fact that Amy Parsons is CSU is the best thing for CSU after President McConnell. We've lost our way, and it is okay to be insular sometimes and focus inward, as we went so external and had so many new folx join our campus, that CSU lost its identity and it sent many faculty/staff away from the University. Being a long-time alum and long-time staff member, I think Amy Parsons is the PERFECT choice for repairing the damage that has been done and needs to be healed.

Candidate Weaknesses: NONE. I do not remotely think not coming from a faculty background is a weakness. In fact, it can be more of a strength. Reading about some faculty members' concerns in the recent Coloradoan article was upsetting. There are a lot of admin pro and state classified staff members on campus and I found the faculty's reservation of Amy Parsons insulting to us in student affairs.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: DO NOT TAKE FACULTY INPUT OVER ADMIN PRO AND STATE CLASSIFIED. IT SHOULD BE A 1/3 SPLIT FOR EACH OR 1/4 WITH STUDENTS. IF ALL PARTS DO NOT LIKE AMY PARSONS, FINE, BUT DON'T GIVE FACULTY MORE OF A SAY THAN THE OTHER STAKEHOLDERS. THEY ARE NOT REMOTELY THE ONLY VOICE THAT MATTERS.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: I appreciate that Ms. Parsons has prior knowledge of and involvement in CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: It concerns me that Ms. Parsons does not have faculty experience. Without the benefit of understanding the work and role of the faculty, it does not engender much faith in her ability to fully consider and understand the needs of faculty, staff, and students at CSU when making decisions about the university and its needs.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The decision to dismiss President McConnell was not transparent. CSU staff, faculty, and students deserve to know the reasons why an effective and competent president was bought out and dismissed. Now, the decision to appoint her replacement is being made with a similar lack of transparency and community input.

Why did CSU hire a search firm to conduct a search that yielded a single candidate? Why is this process not being conducted with an emphasis on transparency and inclusion? This repeated refusal to share information damages my faith in this institution's leadership. We are a public institution, and we are supposed to be accountable to the public and, by extension, to one another. Without transparency, there can be no accountability.

Above all, I would like to avoid the hasty and poorly thought-out appointment of another university president that ends in another \$2 million buyout--that was a wasteful use of our institution's resources.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: As I understand her background, she has never been faculty- has only done adjunct teaching in SAHE, which as someone who has taken SAHE courses, is not what I'd consider a program with exceptional academic rigor. I am also concerned that while she is very familiar with CSU, she has little to no experience in other institutions, which I think we need in order to grow and not fall-back on old, comfortable ways of doing things. Change for change's sake isn't good, but neither is not changing, growing, or expanding because we aren't willing to look and learn from other institutions and bring knowledge from outside into our institution.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I fully admit I don't know much about Ms. Parsons, but comments I've heard from other faculty and staff that stand out to me include:

1. If Tony Frank still wants to be the president of CSU (which many see this appointment as) then he should just do both jobs like he did in the past.
2. This appointment does not look good across the country with other peer institutions; it appears incestuous.
3. This is not an appointment that seems to fit with the model of being a faculty-governed or influenced institution.

With people from across the county looking to move into Colorado and expand their careers here, I can't imagine we couldn't appeal to someone who would really 'wow' us.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: '--The current finalist does not have a PhD or background in research or instruction in higher education. This matters because she will be completely unfamiliar with demands of balancing time among research, teaching and advising, and service. She will be unfamiliar with what it means and the time it takes to apply for grants, design and implement research, mentor students, and engage communities.

--The finalist seems enormously under-qualified, given the above and given her current role as a CEO of an Italian luxury goods e-company.

--The experience the finalist does bring makes me concerned that our public, land grant institution will be run more like a private business, with related expectations, as opposed to the public institution it is.

--The finalist seems to reflect the preferences of current upper administration in the CSU system, as opposed to the preferences of faculty, students, and other members of the CSU community.

--I do not see CSU's main strengths in sustainability, energy, and natural resources reflected in this finalist's qualifications.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: '--Despite the search committee's role in the process, it seems to have lacked transparency.

--This call for feedback from the actual CSU community is going to be ignored. It is just for show.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Dedication to CSU with an understanding of our land grant institutional values (acknowledging that problems with land grant institutions), experience at CSU, alignment with Tony and the Board of Governors, creative thinking, comfortable with being the face of the institution with external stakeholders, and provides some stability.

Candidate Weaknesses: Diversity, Equity and Inclusion- This was absent in her application materials and I haven't seen that focus in past experiences. She needs to demonstrate more evidence of her commitment and focus in DEI work.

Academic Experience-I think hearing her commitment and seeing her alignment with the Provost leadership who knows the academic experience is imperative.

Understanding higher education - I'm not sure she is aware and will embrace current initiatives in promoting equity in higher education.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Important to consider Amy's strengths and weaknesses in building the institution administration. For instance, it would be imperative for the Provost to excel in Diversity, Equity and Inclusion work. Amy needs to empower current administrators, faculty and staff to do their work, lead with a equity-excellence paradigm to make transformative changes at CSU, and demonstrate and foster university-wide collaboration.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: None

Candidate Weaknesses: She has been in the CSU system too long. Amy was part of the stadium redevelopment that no one wanted and made it happen when it was not needed. Amy states: "Every voice should be heard, and while no decision will make everyone happy, the outcomes will inevitably be better with diverse stakeholders involved in the process." Yet when it came to the stadium a majority of voices were ignored. What will prevent her from repeating that again?

The Q&A that came out was all meaningless business speak without any real information. How does an open-door policy really work? Is there really only one job "that could entice me to leave my current role?" What is a firm focus? How do we know she unwavering commitment to CSU? What enforcement mechanisms are there if she does not meet her first 100-day goals? In summary, does Amy know how to run an university?

Why does her company not have any mention of Denver or of her? What is her own company hiding?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Why was Joyce McConnell fired? How come we can't get someone outside of CSU? Are we really paying of all of the stadium related bonds on time? How will you allow for different ideas and directions if needed? What enforcement mechanisms are there if she does not meet her first 100-day goals?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU touts equity and inclusivity in its mission, values and guiding principles, and continues to have challenges with actual implementation. This past year, there has been a mass exodus of people who hold marginalized identities who have been significantly impacted from the lack of accountability and change within the CSU system as a whole.

Compared to the last CSU President, who refused to acknowledge this truth, and was not open to feedback challenging this, AND perpetuated institutional/systemic oppression, which largely caused this mass exodus of so many brilliant and talented people with marginalized identities to flee - my question is:

As a person who appears to hold many privileges in terms of social justice, how does Amy plan on addressing these issues, demonstrating she is personally invested in continued learning and taking action and accountability dedicated to uplifting and promoting marginalized identities?

Secondly, what is her plan to build trust with these communities that her response to this question is not just full of fluffy words that go nowhere? We (I also hold many marginalized identities) are tired of feeling expendable when it comes to authentic equity versus capitalism.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Is known to misrepresent the truth, take credit for the work of others, shift blame off to others, marginalize women. Many people have had experiences with Amy during her tenure here before that were consistently not positive. Is also known to value only her relationship with those above her at the expense of the individuals doing the work for her (by not taking responsibility for her actions as outlined above). She may be well liked by those she intends to impress, but she does not earn the respect of those who work with/for her.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is clear that this was not a fair search and that Amy was the candidate long before there was an opening. She is not liked on campus by those who worked closely with her in the past because she only cares about her relationships with those who can benefit her. Because this survey was modified so that individuals cannot truly voice if they believe she will be a good president by vote, it is probably also true that all feedback will be disregarded. However, if you truly care about CSU, please listen to the voices of individuals who know what it is like to work with Amy -we cannot afford another disaster of a president who will not be responsible for her own actions.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Didn't see Spur through. Left in the middle of the development of it and it seems very unput together relating to financial systems and thoughtful processies.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU's past leadership seems to be very visionary focused but not concerned about all aspects of developing new projects/resources/etc. What is going to pay for things? How are we going to continue to pay for things in the long run (i.e. new stadium upkeep unplanned for)? It is concerning how leadership has pretty dreams but doesn't think things fully through and the long term implications their decisions have. Also things seem rushed to be put together which results in a half put together product. The end goal is always keeping enrollment increasing to continue to be apart of the higher education system, but if continuing to develop things on looks results in increase in prices of fees and tuitions which will turn down enrollment numbers. I certainly know that is not what CSU wants but continued increase in tuition and fees with inflation at a high and pay not being equal creates a very divided and unsound university. Does Amy understand this and thing broader and longterm, while also preparing for the decline in enrollment all around?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: History with CSU

Achievements made when serving as VPUO

Proven passion for our campus

Experiences built when serving in our General Councils office and then VPUO

Her engagement with all corners of the campus and success in building the foundation of SPUR and Todos Santos

Her approach to solving challenges - She is firm in her decision making processes yet takes the time to listen and take all opinions and input into consideration

Candidate Weaknesses: No direct been there done that experience in teaching and or research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: From the perspective of Academics I could see how one might be disappointed that she does not have hands on experience in teaching or research and as much as this is not a popular thought the support side to the campus is just as equally important as the academic side. Under no circumstance could the campus ever do without Facilities Management, Parking and Transportation Services, Business and Financial Services, Budgets, Logistics, Risk Management, Campus Police etc. This is not intended as a comparison of who's more important but rather to say that Amy is extremely experienced in leading the services side of our campus and has a proven track record of doing an exceptional job at it.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU, experience leading CSU for a variety of high-level positions, relationships in the Colorado political landscape, experience with higher-ed law and legal practice, experience overseeing CPC/APC (i.e. understands CSU beyond just the faculty lens), articulate and poised communication style, and experience in business and managing teams in the corporate world.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not a Ph.D. and hasn't conducted/published scientific research. Hasn't been a president of a university before.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: There is no perfect candidate. CSU is a large place made up of many different people, all with different job functions, educational desires, and wants/needs to feel fulfilled and successful. To rule a candidate out, who has many important experiences, talents, and affiliations with CSU, on the basis of a lack of academic research and teaching is not in the best interest of CSU. Advocacy to support the academic integrity of this university is done with reverence and resolve from people not actually doing the teaching and the research every day, already. To say that a president isn't worthy on these merits, sends the message that those not in the classrooms and laboratories aren't worthy either.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I recognize that Board has valid reasons that align with practices at other institutions that result in no opportunities for feedback and vetting through the whole campus before finalist decisions are made. It also feels like the "14 day" period is a formality only and that the decision is made, so any feedback offered by the campus is not really included in the decision making process. While the Board has valid reasons for doing it this way, it must also be acknowledged that the lack of transparency and opportunities for broad campus involvement in selecting our leader has impacts which can make it more challenging to set the finalist up for success. This finalist has many pre-existing connections on campus, some of which are not positive and have already resulted in significant concern from many corners of campus, that the candidate is going to need to figure out how to navigate. I think a second female president in a row who doesn't last long is going to further erode confidence in future Presidents and in the Board - I hope that President-Elect Parsons will receive ample support and guidance from the Board to produce a better, more stable outcome this time around.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She has held various administrative positions at CSU previously, so she is familiar with the executive landscape.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has no academic or research background. As CSU is a research institution this could prove a liability. It is not clear what knowledge she has of how the outreach arm of the University, Extension, functions and how she would support it. Her background at CSU is all very closely aligned with the activities and positions of Tony Frank which intimates that she will not be an objective leader; rather one who will be influenced by the Chancellor's office.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I was very surprised and frankly embarrassed when a sole finalist was announced for the position of CSU president. There is no public information on how this decision was reached and that is concerning. The public listening sessions identified few opportunities for the new president (2 to be precise) and a litany of challenges. Reading through Ms Parson's' application materials it is not at all clear how she can realistically address things like becoming an HSI institution of higher ed, and how to better support our diverse set of students. I see this process as one more black eye for CSU in the last year.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long history with CSU. Diverse skillset and experience that make her qualified for the President role – fundraising, teaching, working with various stakeholders in and outside of CSU (nationally and internationally), legal matters and experience with laws specific to higher-ed institutions. Established connections with folks on campus would allow her to hit the ground running on Day 1. Passion for higher-education, CSU, CSU's history, and our mission as a land-grant institution will ensure that she has CSU's best interests top of mind.

Candidate Weaknesses: Some have stated that she does not have enough faculty and research experience. She does have some experience teaching and I think her passion for CSU would drive her to find folks to help her support these initiatives and/or fill out areas she may not have explicit expertise in. Some also say that her long history at CSU might cloud her judgment when pushing CSU forward; I think that the knowledge, experience, and history Amy has with the institution will give her a unique edge - she knows where we've been, what we tried, and what we can leverage as a university to position us for better funding, enrollment, and staff retention.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Previous experience within CSU systems with strong performance indicators, seems to understand the needs of students, staff, and donors.

Candidate Weaknesses: No previous experience in academics, from past interactions there is a concern about sincerity when she is talking to all members of the CSU community, not seeing an emphasis on diversity initiatives (which is okay because I think that we went too far with President McConnell).

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Will Amy Parsons be able to stand out on her own? It seems like it is more of the same from President Frank's tenor (liking this to a "puppet on a string"). I think that we need to center our university back in our roots, listening to our donors, and not going to such extremes as we did with President McConnell. We NEED to find a balance! CSU is not a safe place for all voices to be heard currently. There is a struggle for those who are more conservative to voice their concerns and feel like they will be heard and respected. We went too far with President McConnell in diversity initiatives (shutting out some voices and not teaching tolerance and grace), but not far enough during President Frank's tenor. CSU is SICK, SICK, SICK right now.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She has a long history with CSU. This brings historical knowledge. She understands how the university has worked in the past but we need new perspectives.

She has a higher level degree in law.

For Tony Frank, she supports Spur. Joyce did not.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has a long history with CSU. It would be nice to have new ideas for CSU moving forward.

She does not have an academic or research skills that are important to understand the basic purpose of our mission.

She is a mouth piece for Tony Frank and will backup any of his agenda.

She was not a great financial manager for the university when leading operations.

She does not have an understanding of the grant process and management , a large portion of our finances.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This feels like a power play for Tony Frank for whatever is next on his agenda for new shiny things. Is he aiming for System control vs University independent control?

The world has changed around CSU and how it has operated in the past. New changes are coming to the student demographics, what they expect from their curriculum, economics for universities. We need new ideas and strategy to move CSU into the next realm.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Understands CSU financial aspects as previous work as VPO.

Has worked with Tony Frank and understands his expectations.

Will look at the university "'outside"' of being a faculty member and consider what is good for the whole university including admin pro and state classified and not just faculty. Might actually bring equitable application of the Faculty/Admin Pro manual (sick leave) and Telework policy (current applied on admin pro and state classified employment groups)

Candidate Weaknesses: May have too strong of ties to Tony Frank and not want to make any changes that he may see as being outside of his political mindset.

May not have enough information on how to go about getting faculty to be willing to make social justice changes for equitable application of CSU policies for all employment groups.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Feel having someone from outside of the CSU system would have been better to bring new insight of how CSU can change from the old regime of "'good ole boys"'. Need someone who is well rounded in viewing social justice for everyone and not just focusing on the current political views of limiting social justice to a few groups.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Clearly understands the operations side of the university from prior to the pandemic

Candidate Weaknesses: Operations is only a small part of running an academic research institution and things have changed since the pandemic. The purpose of the university is academics and research to teach the next generation and give them real world applicable skills and better understand the world around us. The candidate does not have any experience in teaching, writing grants, or conducting research. Also, all of which are the main income drivers for CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This was a completely untransparent process. I am shocked that an institution the size of CSU and with the research aspirations it has, would not at least host open forums for the three finalists before announcing a finalist. Also, it is not clear how the search and screen committee members were picked. The perception is that individual was chosen due to their former working relationship with the current system chancellor because the lack of qualifications would not be acceptable for the leader of any of CSU's peer institutions and those larger than CSU and which CSU strives to grow into.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU experience

Political standing with Tony Frank and the System

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of integrity

Not an academic

History of mis-treatment of staff

Wields power rather than cultivates collaboration

History of top down initiatives that did not engage constituents in co-creation of the vision or implementation (stadium and other projects)

In previous roles, she stated that she doesn't like students

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU needs a president who has come through academia, understands faculty and students, and has the capability of uniting campus and bringing out the best in people. Amy's history is one of wielding power and leading through privilege, threat, and fear, rather than listening to and engaging constituents. In contrast, someone like Tim Mottet, who has genuine care for students and HSIs, would far better serve CSU Fort Collins and its evolving student demographics. She has not done work in equity and inclusion. Choosing Amy will further divide campus and impede genuine progress. The next president needs to be well versed in anti-racism, inclusion, academic rigor and research, and participatory leadership.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Good understanding of CSU and its place in the community. Experience in high administrative role on this campus especially around development and legal matters. Understand the culture and hopefully learned from others successes and downfalls.

Candidate Weaknesses: I do not remember having seen any of her application materials. The only thing I know about her qualifications is what was published by the university, which would obviously highlight her strengths.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I understand that a large number of faculty are disappointed in this nomination because of her lack of academic experience. Many universities are moving to more business minded candidates to fill the roles of president because of the nature of our fiscal environment we find ourselves in. Amy comes to us with a business background but also has the experience of working at CSU for many years in different roles. My hope is that she understands her strengths and weaknesses and will surround herself by people who compliment those areas. In my opinion, the provost is almost just as important in making sure our academic units continue to thrive.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: I cannot speak to specifics of the lone finalist's strengths.

Candidate Weaknesses: I cannot speak to specifics of the lone finalist's weaknesses.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Having chaired and served on several search committees in my almost-ten-years at CSU, and having attended all the preparatory OEO trainings, what I would like to speak to is the following:

At my level of CSU operations, respectfully following the due search processes to identify the optimal candidate, I wonder how it is possible - for this presidential search above all - to have only one finalist that is presented to the campus community? I cannot imagine that narrow a field being acceptable at the department, college, CIOsUs, Athletics, Facilities, etc. level.

I realize that there may be different rules and processes at the presidential level; however, announcing only one finalist does undercut the perhaps overly lauded 'transparency' that is so often referenced. At least that is the perception out here in the field.

Everyone hopes for a successful conclusion to this search. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Strong ties to the University; strong understanding of the legal, business, and operational aspects of higher education; experience teaching at a graduate level; recommended by a large diverse search committee representing a broad cross-section of the University

Candidate Weaknesses: Hasn't been able to overcome dissent from some faculty that have an outdated and fixed lens on higher education and perhaps do not understand the role of a Provost and Assistant Provosts and who may not be happy with the choice unless it was either them selected as President or someone that they were personally consulted about.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy seems like an excellent selection and should be given a chance. I very much appreciate that she knows the identity of the University and as such has a good understanding of how to navigate change in areas that the University needs to grow. If some people don't like the direction the bus is going, they should consider getting off the bus. Nothing is surprising about the direction the bus is going, the map has been available for a very long time.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Has the ability to navigate legal situations and can speak across boundaries as shown in her prior experience as a lawyer and working in facilities. Has the drive to continue their work in the university and work to continue building relationships they have already pre-established.

Candidate Weaknesses: No clear vision for the first 100 days in the sense that, getting faculty and staff/student feedback is not enough action to get anything started. While feedback is needed, this ultimately does not speak to what the president really needs to do in the long run.

"It is incumbent on us to be the caretakers of Abraham Lincoln's challenge, and the visionaries for what it must be in today's world." -In a land grant institution, why are we supporting Abraham Lincoln?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: There was almost no input other than in the initial listening sessions for faculty and staff. This means the process was not entirely transparent as intended. There was also a lack of input from stakeholders that play a key part in the university (i.e. diversity councils).

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Has experience at CSU. Has law background.

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching, research in higher educate experience. I don't know about their DE+I stance.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is concerning that the candidate has worked so closely with Tony Frank. I have nothing negative to say about Tony. I thought he did a great job. And I still think he's doing a great job. It seems to me that we should have a new president with new perspectives, new ideas. My concern is this candidate being so closely tied to Tony, we are not utilizing this opportunity to grow. Someone to bring different and diverse perspectives to CSU. Otherwise, why not just bring Tony back? It's hard for me to believe the hiring committee could not find another candidate.

Learning that this is the final candidate causes me to loose confidence in the administration at CSU. Is this choice a reflection of insecurities within the chancellors office? Is anyone feeling threatened by new, fresh ideas?

Higher education is always evolving and changing. Our administration should reflect this.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Leadership experience at an operational level.

Passion and deep commitment to CSU as an alumna, graduate, parent of CSU student

Candidate Weaknesses: Limited academic experience as it relates to faculty relations, research. No articulated understanding of the culture of academia at levels below the broad operational perspective. Although, I recognize this position works at the macro level - an understanding of needs, challenges, culture within the working walls and classrooms of CSU is lacking and I think would be a large roadblock in this candidates ability to relate to the majority of the employees at CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: She very briefly touches on equity - the candidate does not appear to prioritize a plan to address the lack of diversity this University has amongst it's employees. It concerns me that there is nothing in her CV that shows this has been a priority. Therefore, her mention of social justice, equity, race, identity, inclusivity comes across as empty words with nothing in her history to back up this promised ""commitment""

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: I am unable to assess this candidate's strengths as there has been no opportunities for an open/public forum for the CSU community. This entire process has not been transparent and has been sequestered with those selected for the search committee.

Candidate Weaknesses: I am unable to assess this candidate's weaknesses as there has been no opportunities for an open/public forum for the CSU community. This entire process has not been transparent and has been sequestered with those selected for the search committee.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It was a shock to receive an email about a finalist since there has been no communication whatsoever about where the search committee was in this process. Given the current climate at the university, this lack of transparency seems to be setting this finalist up for failure should they receive the approval of the Board of Governors. Transparency and authenticity was a huge problem for our last president, I strongly recommend providing for the CSU community to meet this finalist before a decision is made.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy has a strong understanding of CSU from many perspectives (student, OGC, VPUO and System Office), and a parent of a current CSU student. Her career here at CSU in those various fields makes her a strong candidate. She was well informed, knowledgeable, listened to her experts leading departments, she was compassionate toward the campus community and a very engaged leader. Amy was always involved in discussing problems and/or concerns with the various councils. With her understanding of CSU from so many perspectives she is a strong candidate who can hit the ground running and can keep us focused on our land grant mission.

Candidate Weaknesses: I do not see any weaknesses of Amy's that would cause her to not be a good candidate for the position of president of CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I support the Amy's recommendation for the position of President of CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The two primary functions of any university are teaching and research. The finalist, based on her resume, has no experience in either of these areas. Her areas of expertise are in development and program management. This is why she did such a great job in her previous position at CSU. It was a good fit with her skillset. However, this background should not be considered appropriate for leading an institution of higher learning. If we were going to consider someone with her background for the President position we might as well open it up to masters level individuals. CSU, while having business functions, is not a corporation and should not be run like one. I simply can't fathom having someone in this role who can't speak to the purpose and values of CSU. Additionally, I see no relevant experience related to promoting or expanding diversity and inclusion in a college environment. After all of the work that we have done across the campus related to DEI, has that all just been performative?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: History with and knowledge of CSU; Ability to develop and implement new initiatives

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic or research background for understanding or addressing faculty affairs; No demonstrated experience, personal or professional, related to diversity and inclusion; Prior experience with operations and development, not actually with advancing higher education

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Concerns about this individual's ability to advance the university's values and goals around diversity, equity and inclusion. Concerns about the culture that this individual will promote and a potentially stronger emphasis on running CSU as a business and not an institution of higher education. Concerns about a lack of understanding around faculty affairs and academic research. Concerns about this individual being the face of the university to external bodies and prospective students. Fort Collins is a predominantly white community, but the diversity of the student body is increasing. We can and have a responsibility to do better.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Intimate familiarity with CSU. Knows the history, struggles and successes. Clearly a capable, qualified candidate to lead.

Candidate Weaknesses: None

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It's been widely circulated that the finalist is unqualified because she has not performed the teaching or research jobs within academia. However, those criticisms are shallow and misplaced. To assume that leadership must somehow uniquely connect with faculty or any other particular group, is not only arrogant and selfish, but dangerous to the wellbeing of the entire institution.

An institution as large and diverse as CSU is, first and foremost, ruled by principles of business. In Colorado, Land Grant status provides virtually no shelter from the same forces as any other corporation and success will depend on our ability to adapt to that reality. Amy has real-world experience in that regard - as well as intimate knowledge of what has made CSU a world-class institution to this point.

She is a wonderful candidate and should be confirmed posthaste.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Great Administrator experience with knowledge of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience in teaching or conducting research but significant experience in administration at the University so she should have understanding of its paramount significance at CSU

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Just because Amy Parsons isn't former faculty doesn't preclude her from serving as an excellent leader and president of this university. It's typical faculty hubris to only support someone who is former faculty for the role of president. Would we eliminate someone's candidacy for president because their only experience was in teaching and research? We have plenty of examples of great faculty who are amazing instructors and have research programs that bring in millions of dollars and struggle when they assume administrative leadership roles. Candidate Parsons can hire a cabinet and provost to lead the academic side of the university that have significant experience in teaching and research to insure research and academia are the pillars of CSU.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Inspirational, successful, relatable, capable! Not being faculty allows her to be well-rounded in her approach to the institution. She is a good listener and will take into consideration the needs of students, staff, faculty and the community. She is fiscally responsible and will help our institution thrive going into the future.

Candidate Weaknesses: None that I am aware of. Our leader does not need to be faculty. I have heard that some faculty believe that our next leader should be faculty. I find this opinion elitist and I am concerned that our faculty are also being sexist in their thinking. I have far more concerns about how our faculty are behaving than I do about our new finalist.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I believe in Amy Parsons and am very excited to see her as the finalist. I find her inspirational, smart, capable and I am very excited to follow her lead. I believe she will listen to all parties at the university and has experience representing a variety of groups and taking into account all perspectives.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: 16 years at CSU in a variety of roles

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience and limited understanding of the academic side and research

Has history of poor leadership on campus from those that worked with her and for her.

Not enough real senior leadership experience to run this tier 1 university

When it says she has private industry experience that is a stretch. She is CEO at a company that has fewer than 10 employees. It is a stretch to say that is private industry senior leadership experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is disappointing that you chose the candidate that you knew that had very little of the key experiences needed to run a university. The process appears to have been just a show and she was always intended to be hired. It seems you just used the search committee as cover for a decision you made before the process began. It is clear that the voice of the majority on campus are against this selection, so please take that into consideration before making your final decision.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU

Proven record of accomplishments

Relationships in Colorado

Ability to lead large major projects

Experience managing and implementing multi-million dollar budgets

Legal knowledge

Business knowledge

Leadership abilities

Developing strong interpersonal relationships

Terminal degree

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of teaching and research experience. That said, I see this as a requirement at the Provost level rather than the President.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The most pressing issues at CSU are financial relating to pay for graduate students, pay for non-tenure track faculty, pay equity, and curbing escalating tuition costs. I view Amy Parsons as a strong candidate who can address these issues through fund-raising, budget discipline, and lobbying the state legislature for support that transfers financial burden from students (tuition) to the original land-grant mission of providing for all residents of Colorado, not just those who can withstand the consistent increases in tuition and fees.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU, close ties to Tony Frank (who was BELOVED), experience in business / corporate world, deeply committed to CSU (alum, parent of current student former employee)

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience as university faculty, familiarity with CSU (not bringing in outside perspectives / experience from other universities)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I understand the likely reasoning for not sharing other finalist candidates, however it would be nice to have an idea of who else was being considered. If there was a way to share an anonymized profile of each candidate (e.g., experience as a VP in an R1 university, social science faculty, etc.), I think that would help with transparency and increase trust and understanding of the hiring decision.

This is a hard job and I just want to recognize that this was likely difficult and that EVERYONE has opinions. I appreciate the work you all do to hear voices from university stakeholders and communicate between everyone.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: The candidate has extensive administrative experience and familiarity with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses:

The candidate has no academic oriented experience nor has voiced strong support for furthering research and academic accessibility for low income students. The Candidate is also an internal hire with no outside expertise to bring to the table. CSU is unlikely to expand and develop its academic and research capabilities when the finalist is unlikely to inject any new ideas.

CSU is primarily an academic non profit university. To have a candidate who has worked as the CEO for a company that essentially focuses on monetary profit above all else seems a poor direction for CSU to take.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I would implore Faculty Council leadership and the Board of Governors to put more consideration in selecting candidates that are more qualified and aligned with primary values of the institution rather than selecting candidates with who bring nothing to the table.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Administrative knowledge of higher education, the CSU System, and CSU-Fort Collins.

Experience managing a large, land grant institution division.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience leading an institution of higher education of any size let alone a university the size of CSU-FC.

No identifiable experience teaching or conducting research.

No demonstrated commitment to equity in education in any of its forms.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The BOG led me to believe the process would be transparent. That door was slammed shut following the information gathering phase. The presidential search needs to be as open as any other position search on campus with at least an open forum with all finalists.

The notion that these candidates need to be protected in the process only perpetuates the worst of higher education. At what point are the Chancellor and BOG held accountable for the process and ultimate damage caused by these decisions being made in nearly complete isolation?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU as well as external (non-higher ed) experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience in higher ed as it relates to academics and research. Hasn't been at the University for some time. Too entrenched in the old ways. Too focused on System rather than Fort Collins campus.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Concerns that the candidate was pre-chosen by Tony Frank and BOG and not correctly vetted through the search committee. It seems that we are being fed a PR campaign to try to mitigate what everyone already knows. It was widely known that she was going to be the next President even before the listening sessions occurred. You can hide behind a search committee, but if you look at the makeup you can see it was heavily weighted to BOG, Alumni, and Donors all hand selected by the BOG and System office. There needed to be more representation of people who are involved directly with the Fort Collins campus directly.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The lack of transparency and oversight in this search process is disturbing. In a period when many of us have been asked to accept minimal pay increases or no increases at all despite a spiraling cost of living, this whole situation--unceremoniously firing Pres. McConnell while still paying her \$2 million, hiring a large and presumably expensive company to conduct a search, and coming up with only one candidate in short order, without input or oversight from faculty, staff, students, and employees, seems irresponsible and short-sighted in many ways. Additionally, concerns raised about Ms. Parsons' complete lack of experience within universities are valid, as are the concerns about her close ties to the Chancellor's office. Many of us choose to work at a university precisely BECAUSE it is not run like a for-profit business, a fact that seems to be increasingly lost on many people.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of Colorado laws and historical knowledge of CSU and past efforts of the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience leading a research institution, lack of understanding of faculty and research needs of the institution, no experience leading a large institution towards the future (mentions a lot about knowledge of how CSU has been, not where it could be going). Also, a commitment to diversity and inclusion was absolutely not present in her materials and that is not acceptable.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Not only does the candidate not seem qualified to lead our university, she also referred to herself as a "Colorado Native" - which came across as someone born in Colorado, not from a Native population. It was tone deaf and then followed by only one mention of wanting to strengthen our commitment to diversity and inclusion but no examples of how or why that is important. I am very disappointed in this nomination.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy knows CSU and loves CSU. The largest part of her career has been spent at CSU. Amy is a parent of a current CSU student, so she has that perspective as well. Amy is incredibly brilliant, a solid decision maker, listens to others, has a really great business sense, and thinks both short and long term. I find Amy to be personable and I think she'll do a good job with fundraising. Lastly, Amy trusts her people to do their good work and is not a micromanager.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy has growth areas, particularly in the areas of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, Justice, and Belonging. I hope she is willing to be humble and engage in deep exploration and conversation regarding this area because Joyce stumbled and was not able to recover because she was defensive and believed she already knew everything.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy is a good choice and I believe she will lead the University in the right direction.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU at many levels

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic or research background; extremely cozy relationship with chancellor raises concerns about independence and transparency from BOG and chancellor going forward.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The end of this process felt closeted from university employees which raises questions about the transparency of the selection and the overall qualifications of the candidate to effectively and proactively advocate for the interests of faculty and administrators and students. Admin, faculty and graduate workers have been underpaid and underappreciated at CSU and morale is sagging because we feel ignored by upper-level leaders and decisionmakers as living costs in our city have skyrocketed and CSU salaries and wages have barely increased. This hire does not, on the surface, represent a move to make the campus employee community feel more secure in our livelihoods.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Close relationship with Tony Frank.

Has good view of higher-level university operations.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience as faculty and department head.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: My main concern: can CSU move forward with a president who is steeped in the thinking and approaches of past CSU leadership? Notwithstanding his skills and experience, I was frankly disappointed that Rick Miranda was appointed interim, because it felt like a step backwards, not to mention that it felt like the ""wise white guys"" were coming to the rescue of the woman who couldn't get it right.

Also, when I returned to CSU from the non-profit world, with my PhD but as an Admin Pro, not Faculty, I quickly realized how important it was to understand the leadership of Faculty differs from leadership of a non-profit or business. I'm unconvinced Amy Parson's experience has been sufficient for her to have that understanding.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Employed by CSU and System Office, familiar with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate lacks R1 research, academia experience and financial acumen. As the VP for Operations Ms. Parsons, appointed Lynn Johnson as AVP to oversee the financials of the university. Has experience with project development and negotiation (Stadium, INTO, Todos Santos,) yet all these initiatives have a negative ROI costing the university money. Does not have the aptitude to lead a university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Disappointed that Ms. Parsons was the only finalist in a market that is ever changing. Appointed as VP, Executive Chancellor and now President, was this a legitimate search, were the principles of community applied? CSU needs to be able to transform and compete with other R1 institutions and be strategic. With this leadership CSU will be stuck in the past with obsolete practices, thinking and no innovation.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Past administrative experience at CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No discernable research/teaching experience, and her "'founding CEO"' experience after having no direct business experience looks as if she created her own position in order to meet minimum qualifications for the President role when she wasn't qualified in 2019.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is well known that Amy Parsons has a close relationship with Tony Frank, and it is rumored that their relationship has even become inappropriate in the past. This is a major hurdle to get over with faculty/staff/community members when it seems like someone is (once again) being appointed to a role quickly rather than maintaining the integrity of a nationwide search. At a time when there are many interim leadership positions across campus waiting for the direction of the new President, this is not a time to waste the trust of campus partners and community.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: The business background which I think is better suited for our university. Someone who is internal to CSU and is not an outside hire from some woke university that has no bearing on what we are trying to do here in Colorado.

Candidate Weaknesses: None that I can see.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: QUIT. We have a quality candidate that fits many more boxes, and just because she didn't say ""faculty"" doesn't mean she isn't trying. We need fresh young blood to lead our campus. We've had presidents that have fit YOUR mold all these years, and look what it's brought us. We brought in Joyce and what it brought us was more embarrassment on a national scale and inmates running the asylum. We need someone with a fresh set of ideas.

Who would you recommend? YOU are not offering any better solutions. It seems like the Faculty Council is a pouty-little baby that didn't get its way. Not a good look for you all.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She looks nice.

She does have some history with CSU, in fact it was her entire career.

Candidate Weaknesses: It is an embarrassing pick. There have to be more qualified individuals out there with actual leadership experience.

We don't need another lawyer -- we need someone with an academic background.

All I hear from people who have worked with her is that she has very poor judgement.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy Parsons is a very weak candidate and choosing her would be a black eye for CSU. I thought CSU was a serious research one university. However, comparing Amy Parsons to other women university president's leads to the conclusion that we are not.

Her educational and work experience is far, far weaker than the presidents at other like universities. I have a hard time believing that our pool of candidates was so weak that Amy was the best we could do.

Embarrassing pick.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: * Prior experience in multiple roles with increasing complexity at CSU

- * Knowledgeable of fiscal and operational aspects of the University
- * Initiated or involved with academic and non-academic ventures
- * Student centric approach
- * Alignment with land-grant mission and CSU Principles of Community
- * Recognizes faculty and staff central to university mission
- * Willing to listen and ask for input/feedback

Candidate Weaknesses: While limited in academic teaching and research, her choice of Provost can mitigate that and is crucial to establishing standing with faculty

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think Amy Parsons has the passion for CSU needed to lead and represent the flagship university at a time it's sorely needed following the massive turnover/exodus of leadership positions during the previous administration; coupled with the necessary experience to guide her in administering CSU successfully.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Tony's pick for President

Good relationship with Tony Frank

History of working at CSU in the past

A bit of executive leadership experience

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience

No research experience

No leadership experience in an academic setting

Legal background will feed into CSU's risk-averse environment

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I have worked with Amy in the past and have no concerns about her professionalism. However, she has neither an academic background, nor a research background, so leading a large Carnegie I Research institution will be outside of her strengths. She simply does not have the background to understand the mindset of an academic, the heart and sole of what we do at CSU.

Her rise and promotion at CSU was always associated with Tony Frank, casting doubt on Tony's ability to make an objective decision and highlighting a preferential relationship with Amy.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: '--Already knows Chancellor Frank

--Familiar with CSU main campus and Chancellor's Office

--Alumna of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: '--Although I don't know where the role of the president ends and the chancellor begins, I believe Amy is loyal to Dr. Frank and will do whatever he wants. In other words, Amy will likely be a puppet for Dr. Frank, not a president who brings academic leadership experience from another institution.

--I'm not convinced that someone with a law degree and no academic experience in higher ed will make a good president, esp. as far as faculty are concerned.

--I believe Joyce McConnell's radical DEI agenda caused Dr. Frank a lot of problems. To avoid a similar situation, I believe Dr. Frank is installing his own person that will allow him to keep the flagship campus running smoothly with no friction from competing agendas.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Stated above.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy's a seasoned administrator with a long track record of undertaking significant strategic initiatives to completion. In her role as President she'll excel at visioning, fundraising, partnerships, and getting stuff done.

I'm fully supportive and believe she should be given the chance to succeed.

Candidate Weaknesses: She can hire a competent leadership team around her to navigate any weaknesses. People may complain about her not having been a faculty member, but that's what you have the provost (our chief academic officer) for.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The university community needs to give her a chance. Faculty aren't trained to lead large complex organizations with thousands of employees, it's ok to bring in non traditional seasoned executives (especially who have familiarity with higher ed) in a time where higher ed is facing a ton of pressure in all directions.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Since Tony Frank selected her, he likely won't fire her like he did McConnell, so CSU won't have another big payout...

I'm still sad about McConnell. I thought she was doing a good job, listening to students, and focused on bringing change to CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: No sense of research, teaching, or JEDI initiatives and creating a more welcoming environment for minorities. The Ripple Effect was in 2009/2010. Since then JEDI initiatives have (rightfully) gained steam everywhere except Parson's CV.

She seems like a 'yes-woman' to Tony Frank. In her briefings on the stadium, for example, it was clear that she was not there to solicit and address input, but just to tell us that it was going to happen.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The sense on the sidewalk is that Tony Frank is gate-keeping who can be president, stopping CSU from bringing in fresh perspectives and change.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Apparently, she interviewed well, and the board feels she is competent to fulfill the position.

Having served as an Executive Chancellor for CSU in the past, she has some institutional knowledge and knows many of the players in Higher Education.

Being able to get along with Dr. Frank seems to be an important skill that she appears to have.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not sure she has the teaching, engagement or research experience to relate to and lead these important endeavors of a Land Grant Institution.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I wish we knew more about why Dr. McConnell was let go before her contract was complete. Her leaving also resulted in a big shuffle amongst many campus and outreach leadership positions. Lack of transparency around these issues has left me distrustful of the board's current and future decisions. My pride, support and loyalty to CSU are being tested.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of the CSU environment, CSU System, and unique opportunities that Higher Education institutions face.

Candidate Weaknesses: Unsure of the candidates commitment to community of principals especially around inclusion and equity as there was not much mention in application materials. As much as knowledge of CSU is a strength, it is also a weakness as I don't believe CSU employees are looking for more of the same. It is time for change and growth so there is concern that Amy is part of the same administration that has been running CSU for over a decade which is not desired.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Was this a fair and transparent hiring process? Would like to understand how we got to the point to have 1 finalist. Are we not attracting applicants for a Presidential search through a nation wide pool? If not, we should look at why that is.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She will do what Tony asks of her and he will get along with her.

Candidate Weaknesses: She is underqualified for this position and HATES CSU! Having worked with her on campus in previous roles, she does not support faculty, and had made that known. She is clueless when it comes to working with and supporting our state classified employees. She has no concept of an annual salary of \$40K.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Shame on you BOG. I can't believe we passed up a former Governor for a cosmetics attorney as our next President. What a joke! Tony should not be our Chancellor and his actions are an embarrassment to CSU! His treatment of Joyce was awful. Hiring another woman will not change that.

Amy burned too many bridges with her former actions and treatment of faculty and staff. She will not be welcomed to campus in her new role.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: I think the key points are that she isn't academically qualified. She was promoted at CSU without searches, her business experience at a tiny international for profit haven't prepared her, and her short temper and taking credit for others' work from her time at CSU shows she doesn't have the right temperament. Finally her business experience is being positioned as an asset, yet two of her primary business ventures at CSU (INTO and Todos) have been and are disasters.

I was in her SAHE class, the only academic experience she has, and she was always poorly prepared, she didn't value diversity in the class, and didn't even care enough to learn our names in this small class.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please don't make her an offer or the few remaining exceptional people left at CSU after Joyce will also leave.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long-standing experience working with CSU administration. High-level experience with CSU operations. Experience with business partnerships and other state and local communities.

Candidate Weaknesses: She was appointed to her prior positions at CSU so she rose to high-level roles at CSU without going through a selection process. Being the sole candidate for the Presidential position, it feels like she is being appointed again without going through a selection process with other candidates. She seems to be handed-picked by leadership and feels like some cronyism at play. This may not be correct but the selection process should be more transparent about the scrutiny of their process.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please provide more details about the process leading up to selecting a sole candidate.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU-alumna, former university leader, current parent

Committed to CSU, System

Innovative, creative

Hard worker

Hopefully she is more humble and has learned how to work with a team in the time since she left CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of knowledge and experience with DEIJ issues;

Previously did not adequately support those that reported to her

Likes to be in the lime light without giving credit to those that did the work

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Will need to help the campus heal from COVID and past leadership

Must be willing to depend on her leadership team (must put together a strong leadership team from current staff (has some individuals in place now)

Must be willing to admit what she needs to learn and spend time listening and getting to know staff, faculty, and students

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: '- very politically astute

- has the support of Tony Frank
- can generate high level ideas and vision

Candidate Weaknesses: '- no academic or research experience

- chaotic and disorganized leadership
- good at ideas, but execution is lacking.
- lacks attention to details.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: When I heard that Amy Parsons was named as the final and only candidate I was filled with anxiety. My experience with her during her time at CSU was not favorable. I found her unapproachable. I found her leadership to be disorganized, and unsupportive.

Should her appointment be finalized (which looks like it will be) I plan to do everything in my power to stay under the radar. Depending on what happens, it will probably accelerate my plans to retire from this organization.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU, leadership experience, legal understanding

Candidate Weaknesses: Is not an accomplished academic, has not held positions of Dean or Provost or VP for Research; is not well regarded as someone who can understand and elevate the work of researchers and professors. Her successes are largely seen as a result of being placed in positions and work destined for success.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The optics on placing Amy Parsons as the president, given her long history in working with/for Tony Frank and lack of academic credentials, are rough at best. It smells of cronyism.

Despite the large committee and process, from the outside it just doesn't feel right and no amount of telling people that it was a fair and inclusive process is going to fix that.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Proven track record of success working at executive levels within complex organizations, including CSU. Clear champion of CSU and its brand.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not familiar enough with the candidate to critique

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The position is not a political office that candidates campaign for to promote themselves among a public that will ultimately choose or reject their representation. The results of a survey like this are inherently meaningless as most staff and faculty likely know very little about the candidate's experience and aptitude as they were not involved in the search process. Many are also likely to have a very limited understanding of what the job qualifications even are. Arm-chair quarter-backing is not a viable path to a hiring process.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Previous experience at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Her work on INTO and Todos Santos should rule her out from a leadership position alone. Poor management, ignorance of white supremacy and colonization, and a general lack of "doing your homework" is not what this university needs right now. We just got done with that and this feels like more of the same. And we know how it is going to be based on her tenure at CSU before. We need someone with a better understanding of privilege and power. Her tenure as legal counsel at CSU was fraught with interpersonal issues and taking credit for others' work. She was promoted through CSU without searches or the possibility for people to comment on the process.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please do not hire this person in this role!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Business background, law background, engagement with rural communities, involvement in collaboration campuses across the state. She can ensure that CSU brings in vital fundraising dollars, improves efficiencies from a business perspective, improves our messaging and promotes all of the incredible work CSU does, vs. past presidents who are afraid of shouting our successes from the rooftops.

Candidate Weaknesses: None immediately visible. She is an experienced professional with strong ties to CSU and will help this university shine.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Ignore the faculty that is droning on about her lack of experience writing a peer-reviewed paper. Her business acumen is what is needed for this role. Thank you for bringing her to the top of the candidate list!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: The candidate has extensive experience at Colorado State University, understands our values, our traditions, our struggles and our successes. She is someone already intimately familiar with the workings of the university and brings a great sense of appreciation for the student experience at CSU from her time as a student and also as a parent of a current CSU student.

Candidate Weaknesses: To some, the fact that she has never worked in an academic or research role is a perceived weakness. I do not feel that it is.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Are you actually going to share opinions supporting this candidate or only the negative opinions that fit the view of the Faculty Council which believes, incorrectly, that it represents the view of all faculty on campus?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Interested in being the next CSU President

Candidate Weaknesses: Less informed about a new Vice President position pertaining to Native American affairs- this not a diversity position. Knowledge about why this position reports directly to the President and not to CSU's VP for Inclusive Excellence.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: See Weaknesses comments. Also, the recent Q&A responses to diversity was generic- needs to be more specific. Highlighting some important aspects of CSU's diversity efforts would help. Perhaps her past diversity experience and exposure to diverse communities is less developed- may be a learning curve for her, as inclusiveness is more than stating every voice should be heard, it also means some voices have to be brought to the forefront.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU ally and familiarity with CSU System

Candidate Weaknesses: Experience with other universities - depth of understanding/experience with teaching and research

Willingness to align and advocate for the university which may be in opposition to BOG

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The lack of transparency in the hiring process was concerning. The timeline was shared about the process but no updates along the way in the process.

Is bringing someone in as president who is so familiar with the system a good idea? And will the leadership then be filled with more individuals who are familiar and not new to CSU System? Diversity is critical in a university setting to represent all aspects of higher education and the many stakeholders.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Coloradoan, prior CSU experience, alumnus, parent of current student.

Candidate Weaknesses: Attorney; someone with faculty experience and/or business background is better suited to the position. I'm not impressed by her current ""international business"" selling Italian perfumes. Anyone can put up a website.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Seems like another of Tony Frank's cronies. The fact that she's an attorney and has been involved in Todos Santos and SPUR development are not strengths in my mind, but instead are weaknesses. We don't need another slick politician type! CSU needs to quit with its quest for world domination and instead focus on its land grant mission, by shoring up its education programs for Coloradoans!!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long history in CSU administration, family ties to CO and CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Poor writer (Source Q&A article full of grammatical issues), provides the same answer regardless of the question (I love CSU), difficult to determine experience with research administration, doesn't appear to know what is going on on campus at this point

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is really difficult to assess this person based on what we've received. There is fear this individual will be just a "yes man" for Tony Frank. The process for determining the finalist should've been more transparent in general. Not knowing who the other options would've been makes it very difficult to feel like the right person has been selected.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: 1. Former association with the institution in serious management roles
2. Good background from both academic participation (VC) and Administrative (including legal) that is useful for a chief executive type role.
3. Record of accomplishments both in the U and outside the U that indicates leadership potential appropriate for the role.

Candidate Weaknesses: None noted. From a skillset and experience and relationship with the U this is a very good candidate on paper. No personal interaction to form other judgements.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I would heartily endorse this candidate based on the published experience and recommendation from the committee. I do not have any personal experience to judge further.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU administrative systems and legal. Existing network within CSU and higher state admin levels.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience as professor/faculty. More difficult to promote perspectives.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This would be an unprecedented hire in terms of the lack of visibility, moving forward with a single finalist, the pace of those actions, and the lack of experience with teaching/research by the finalist. I think the parallels between CSU President and a CEO are inappropriate. The fact that faculty council is soliciting input less than 10 days prior to the anticipated start date for Ms. Parsons speaks volumes. I respect their thoughtful attention to this matter.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU Alumni, legal background, experience working at/for CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience in a University leadership role
concerned she can't get the full support of University faculty/staff, taken seriously

perceived as being Tony Frank's puppet

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Is this the proper candidate to fix all campus issues from the top down -

internal communications across all CSU related campus(es)

the need for restructuring of facilities management

recognition of all the DEIJ issues

salary and funding discrepancies across campus

lack of adequate space for academic and non-academic programs/ need for audit of misused or under utilized space and resources across campus(es)

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU

Support of Chancellor

Candidate Weaknesses: '-No academic experience

-It appears her international ecommerce company has very few employees. This experience is limited and not necessarily transferrable to the University community

-Reputational issues throughout CSU that will be hard to overcome.

-The selection has the appearance of nepotism

-Statements to date have emphasized a love for CSU, not an understanding of teaching and research and scholarship

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I worry that Ms. Parsons' reputational issues (folks think she was mean, mismanaged large projects, had questionable ethics etc.) will impair her ability to be successful and move CSU forward.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: connection and knowledge of the university

Candidate Weaknesses: lack of research and academic experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I do not know enough about this candidate to offer an informed endorsement or criticism. I suspect many of us feel that way, which is likely intentional. I wish there could have been an open forum with the semi-finalists like we have when hiring any other position in the university. While I understand the committee was robust, it excluded the community at large, which underscores a lack of transparency as a whole- a primary criticism of past university leadership. I get the feeling this choice had been made a while ago, and all of this is a formality.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU and the CSU system; experience at CSU as a student and an employee; a proven advocate for CSU

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Despite what faculty voices will say, Amy's lack of a previous appointment as a member of the faculty, does not in any way preclude her from a successful tenure as president. It will be up to Amy to meet, get to know, and understand faculty but it will be up to faculty to get to know Amy, understand her vision, and support it if we are to move forward as an institution. Let's avoid a divisive start to her presidency and instead choose to welcome, support, and celebrate her and the possibilities that lie ahead for CSU!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Was VP previously at CSU

Hard worker

Intelligent person

Candidate Weaknesses: Yes man (person) for Tony Frank

Would not stand up for what was right for the University

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: From my point of view, this is nothing more than Tony Franks good ole boy network at it's best. Especially after the email Mr. Frank sent out trying to justify Ms. Parsons nomination. Will all the other candidates that were very well qualified, this seems more like a continuation of Mr. Franks agenda than what's best for the University. With all the resignations across campus, there needs to be new blood - including members of the BOG. They seem to be in Mr. Franks back pocket also.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She has served in many roles at CSU over the years as well as working in industry. This provides a diverse background of knowledge.

Candidate Weaknesses: While she has served in many roles over the years, she has never been a faculty member so does not have first hand knowledge or experience with the challenges faced by the faculty.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Since the CSU community was not allowed to meet, or know about other candidates, this selection feels like a Tony pick. Without knowing who any of the other candidates were it is impossible for me to support the final decision. Amy may be the best candidate, but from a sample size of 1 that is hard for me to believe.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: None for leading an institution of higher education.

Candidate Weaknesses: Very limited higher education experience which is very concerning.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy's nomination to this role is disappointing and very concerning. She does not appear to have the background and skills necessary to lead an institution of this size. While I do not know her and have not crossed paths with her, several of my colleagues have and have shared an unfavorable opinion of how she has interacted with other colleagues.

If she was the best candidate, I would suggest that the committee go back to the drawing board and relaunch the search to find more qualified candidates.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Appears to have an overarching awareness of the CSU campus, has an overall understanding of a university's inner workings based on previous work & work within the SAHE program.

Candidate Weaknesses: Doesn't appear to have a research background but I don't assume she will not be doing a lot of research in this role.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think it's great that we are bringing in someone from a different background than the traditional faculty or research. While I see these experiences as important, ultimately, CSU is a business & needs to be fiscally responsible. Her previous work at CSU has already displayed her investment to the university & to our students.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long history with CSU.

Collaborative

Candidate Weaknesses: Less experience on the Faculty side.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The University is not just an institution of learning, it's a giant BUSINESS. Someone with a business mind, melded with the experience of running the operational side of the University is a welcome fresh air. Not 100% of efforts can be made to the Academic side, there are thousands of employees that keep this University running on a daily basis and far too long they have been ignored in adequate funding and buildings to reside in that are up to code. It's about time we get a leader that can see both sides and start to balance the scales.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Donor relations, white supremacy, working up the chain ladder

Candidate Weaknesses: No real support for teachers/research, staff and students

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I don't believe that she was truly involved in DEI or Strategic planning when it comes to making progress with equity pay for the employees nor undergraduate students experience. She taught some, but, not enough to truly make a difference while she was at CSU in making a difference for our undergraduate students much less the equity pay for our faculty/staff. I think she's selected because she's a pretty sight for Tony and that as a white president, it doesn't do well for our DEI efforts.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU and the ability to "hit the ground running"
Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of academic experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think if you are looking for someone to be an independent administrator it would be wise to look elsewhere. This is a Tony Frank loyalist who will likely defer to his preference when it comes to CSU-Fort Collins.

With that being said, it is a reality that Tony is here and so it may be best to row with the tide as opposed to against...we all saw how the former presidents tenure aged.

My preference is to get Amy here and work with the devil(s) we know to stop the constant turnover at senior levels of leadership.

"

Employee Classification: Personal administrativo

Candidate Strengths: Que tiene mucho conocimiento en la parte de funcionamiento de una organizacion y parece que si sabe mucho de negocios.

Candidate Weaknesses: Poca experiencia en la parte academica y en investigacion. conoce muy bien a todos los del board y parece que hubo favoritismo al ser seleccionada para el puesto

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Seria bueno que nos hubieran dado la oportunidad a todo el campus de participar en algo como un open forum. Que nos hayan dado la oportunidad de escuchar lo que tienen que ofrecer los otros candidatos y que no hayan arbitrariamente decidido ofrecer el trabajo a una sola persona.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU well

Candidate Weaknesses: Can't comment, don't know the candidate

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The lack of transparency in the hiring process is concerning. The finalists were not known to the CSU community, and no open forums were done to allow the community to ask questions of the candidates.

I have seen many other instances where lower profile, managerial positions have to go through multiple interviews and open forums, and thus the candidates become public. If the presidential search can be conducted secretly, then all interview processes in CSU should be done confidentially until a hire is made, regardless of the position.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU; Personable, dynamic leader.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic background. Marginally 'qualified' to lead organization of CSU's size/complexity. Prior experiences demonstrate Amy to be a 'make it happen' style leader with little patience for dissenting opinions or challenges. Has given appearance of 'favoritism' in past decisions, often appointing leaders who are not qualified to take on roles.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I believe that Amy is not the best candidate for this role. While she has enthusiasm for and knowledge of CSU, she's shown herself to be a leader who cuts corners/takes shortcuts to achieve her agenda.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Young, slim and attractive female

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of requisite experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: In CSU DEI and Whiteness training, we learned that relatively slim, young, and attractive white individuals (in today's discriminatory environment - mostly women) are far more likely to be offered positions than older, less-attractive, minorities and white men. While I don't know Ms. Parsons personally, the perception that she was selected over imminently more qualified older men is inescapable. President Parsons has her work cut out for her demonstrating she can lead better than, say, former Colorado Governor Bill Ritter .

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy knows CSU and was great in her role as VP for Operations before moving to the system office.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has not been in the researcher/faculty role, but I don't see that as a problem.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I reported to Amy as xxxxxxxxxx when she moved into the VP for Operations role and she was very approachable and helpful and listened to our concerns and helped the council get several things changed that made life better for APs. I support her becoming the next CSU President, even though she does not have the research/faculty background that some may think is a requirement for the job.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU system.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate does not have research or teaching experience. The candidate has championed and executed concerning initiatives, such as Todos Santos. I have deep concern that the candidate will prioritize ""shiny object"" projects like Spur and Todos Santos, rather than deepening our core purpose at CSU around research and teaching.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I have some personal familiarity with the candidate and think the candidate's prior spending on travel and necessity of that spending should be examined before moving forward with this candidate.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Prior executive experience with the university; experience running a business and making a profit; legal background and knowledge to navigate the litigious nature of our current society; quite attractive.

Candidate Weaknesses: Law degree from that other university; may be too goo looking to be taken seriously by some people.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Hopefully you didn't focus too much on ""wokeness"" and selected someone for their true ability to lead a university, generate revenue and not spend most of their time on special interest groups and trying to appease every whining, squeaky wheel.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Strong ties to the university in many different capacities - as a former student/alum, as a staff member, as an administrator, and as a current parent.

Has a significant background at the university, working through very challenging times including the Great Recession.

Has experience AWAY from CSU in an entrepreneurial setting.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I understand concerns around the piece of understanding faculty needs. I think that Amy Parsons can offset that gap by making sure that she has a provost who she respects and knows will advocate for the faculty.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of institution and people of CSU due to her past positions at CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience/track-record on key components of CSU - as far as I know she doesn't have experience or accomplishments related to the teaching and service mission. Doesn't seem to any substantial track-record in fundraising and other activity to bring important dollar resources to CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Interesting pick considering the weaknesses of this candidate. I trust the Chancellor has good reasons for this candidate to be brought forward for this incredibly important role.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU experience

Seems to understand the CSU mission because of her experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Hasn't demonstrated a commitment to underserved communities or students which is vital as a land grant university

Publicly stated in interviews during her time as CEO about her desire to move on from higher ed

Lack of teaching and research experience. I'm not faculty and even I understand how problematic that is for someone leading a research 1 university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I would like to know who the other 2 semifinalists were and why they weren't moved forward as a finalist.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy Parsons does not seem to have any strengths that are unique to her, she seems to have the same qualifications as anyone at her level, nothing uniquely impressive or stand out about her.

Candidate Weaknesses: Too much time at CSU, I don't believe she'll bring a fresh perspective and the last thing CSU needs is more of the same. What a disappointing selection.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Instead of choosing from Tony Frank's fan club, find someone who will make the right decisions for the university and actually move us forward rather than continuing on the same trajectory.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She's incredibly qualified as a lawyer, university counsel, and CEO. I also appreciate her connections to CSU as an alum, parent of a student, and former employee at both the university and system levels. She also seems to have a good relationship with Tony Frank, which is important.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am really pleased that they are considering a woman for this position and I love that she's an alum and parent of a current student. She doesn't just have a history with CSU, though, she seems to have a vision for where we can go in the future.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: '--Familiar with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: I am very concerned about the lack of research and teaching experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU keeps hiring lawyer/businesspeople rather than academics for its highest leadership positions. This exemplifies the corporatization of higher education and this trend must be reversed. It is time faculty and staff make their voices heard about what purpose of higher education is--to create an intellectual environment where all can think, create, reflect, and problem-solve rather than be accountable to arbitrary policies and profits.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Lots of operational experience running large, complex business. CSU alumna and Northern Colorado connections. Experience and familiarity with campus.

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not have a strong academic background. I don't see this as a detractor from

her being able to steer the organization, however. While the purpose of CSU is academic, the operation requires much knowledge about how to run the business

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It will be important that Amy opens strong pathways for academic leadership to complement her vast operational expertise.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: I worked with Amy when she was with OGC when I started 15 years ago. I am excited that she will be the next CSU President. She is smart, educated, and committed to CSU. She should have been the 1st woman president and a shame she has follow in the footsteps of the prior president. She knows CSU, she supports students through Student Affairs and I look forward to the leadership she will bring!

Candidate Weaknesses: Yes, she doesn't have faculty credentials. I'm sure she will rely on her VP staff. No president will know everything.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Very bright, quick to learn, business head, familiar with CSU and the job of president of CSU. Many business contacts. Excels at business, politics and networking. Focus.

Candidate Weaknesses: Does not understand rural CO - and has little interest. Todos Santos and SPUR were Ready-Fire-Aim and both required extensive damage control with the surrounding communities (Did you see the video of the town burning the CSU flag on the beach?)?. She is not careful with people when she has a goal in mind.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Be sure this is the leader you want.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Connected to CSU. Successful in previous positions.

Candidate Weaknesses: Knowledge of faculty, research, etc. seems very, very limited. While CSU is not simply made of faculty that seems like a huge learning gap. Also, I don't feel like I know Amy Parsons at all - she seems hand selected by Tony Frank.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: There is a LOT of gossip on campus about how Amy was selected. People often refer to Tony's selections as 'friends with Tony' or 'in with Tony'. Therefore, the search does not seem competitive rather than hand picked.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She has clearly demonstrated that she loves CSU - in all her roles at the institution. She was an awesome VPUO when she served in that role.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has never been a university president, and while she has clearly served close to that role, it will be a learning curve.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is fantastic to see a woman returning to this role. No offense to the men, but it is time to demonstrate our commitment to diversity & inclusion by making sure our leadership team is representative of the folx they serve.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Strong experience in higher education, strong record of accomplishments at CSU, vision to move CSU forward, understanding of what makes CSU a great place to study/work, record of strong relationships and appreciation for non-academic areas of the university - Student Affairs, Facilities Management etc., proven track record of working with auxiliaries and extension. Not likely to use CSU as stepping stone to another university.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy would have been a better hire than the last president.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Has a history at CSU / grew up in a rural community / has a background in 4H. These make her a good fit at CSU and it's focus on extension.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Do not cave to criticism just because she is not a person of color. If she is qualified then continue with the nomination. I know there is tremendous pressure for people to choose a person of color for leadership positions- but if this not done solely because they're the best candidate for the job, people see right through it.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Previous experience at CSU, I guess.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic background.

Previous ties to higher-ups in the CSU system make it seem like a nepotism hire.

Lack of experience in other higher-ed orgs mean that she doesn't have a good view of what else is out there for possible ways to improve things.

A CEO? Is she going to run this place like a business?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Honestly, Joyce was awesome and you shouldn't have fired her. Either bring her back or get someone just like her.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU.

Can bring insight to the business side of the university.

Is incredibly driven.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has not worked in higher education in some time, including during the pandemic.

Has a history of not taking feedback and continuing on what she would like to do.

I worry about her understanding and experience with working directly students.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Is this candidate going to put CSU's students first when making decisions and seek for pay equity for staff?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Does not have any research, teaching experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I feel like we have Dr. Albert Bimper that can be an excellent candidate. Hopefully they have been considered.

We are a research institution, we need someone that understands those needs.

We are a Land Grant institution, does Ms. Parsons have an understanding of what this entails?

We are also trying to move into a Hispanic Serving Institution and need leadership that can lead us.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She seems extremely qualified and all whom I have spoken with, who have interacted with her on some level, have been highly impressed. She has demonstrated her commitment to diversity and inclusion in her work and will be able to connect with people inside and outside of CSU in a variety of capacities. She'll be able to hit the ground running and provide strong leadership based on her intimate knowledge of the university and our state.

Candidate Weaknesses: N/A

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The selection of this candidate does not seem to be in the best interest of the CSU community, but in the best interest of the administration in executing an agenda with someone in this position who can be easily influenced by Tony Frank.

The selection of this finalist is a reflection of the lack of commitment in moving the University forward in a positive direction toward equity, diversity, inclusion, and transparency.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching experience. Lacks student perspective. Seems more poised to run the university like a business and not an institution that centers the student experience. Questionable commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: An uninspired choice seething of nepotism and cronyism. I have no faith that anything good will come out of this president's tenure; let's hope it's a short one. Do better next time.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Longtime experience with CSU and CSU system.

Candidate Weaknesses: Her lack of teaching experience *might* be considered a weakness, but I don't really believe she doesn't understand the concerns and needs of the faculty. She'll be in constant conversation with the provost, as well as many deans and faculty members, who certainly do understand those things. I'm certain she'll be aware of the need for input from that constituency.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with the state of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience related to teaching and learning; no experience in a leadership role outside of the CSU system.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: My biggest concern is related to the lack of experience related to higher education (outside of CSU), and most of her experience coming from the system. I feel her decision and guidance of CSU-FC will be influenced by the state, and not focused on student success.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Concern that they are coming from a business perspective and not an educational background.

Concern that with their deep history with CSU, they will not be open to changes and where the world of higher education is moving towards.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It was very concerning that this process was so secretive and hidden from the public and CSU staff. Is the Board of Governors only hiring people they know?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Has a lot of experience and is an advocate for hire education

Candidate Weaknesses: All of her experience is at CSU. It would be nice to have a candidate that could bring new and different experiences to CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am extremely concerned that the her Q&A in the Source barely mentions research. Research is an important aspect of CSU and should be supported and celebrated as the future of knowledge and education.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Tony Frank loyalist

Candidate Weaknesses: Academic ignorance. Marginal legal skills. Poor administrative record at CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: If this is the best candidate for President that we can attract, our University is in dire straits. There were a times in our history when our President held the respect of our external political and academic environments- Chamberlain and Yates as examples. We have lost that stature.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Deep understanding of CSU and professional experience at the administrative and operations level of CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of university educational background as a professor.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Concerns that this person has worked for a previous CSU president and as a chancellor along with that person and will simply be a mouthpiece and not an independent leader. Hasn't articulate any type of vision for CSU.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: '-Wide variety of roles within the university

-Was a 4-H student who likely understands the importance of agricultural programs at a land grant university

-Must have some sense of politics and speaking being a WH intern

Candidate Weaknesses: '-Would be nice if her background was in science so that she can better understand biological research, how long it takes, the need for basic research

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: no comment

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: I don't know; we had not chance to hear from her before she was named.

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not have experience with core elements of the university, including teaching and research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is not appropriate to have a closed search for a President of a major state university, particularly after the public perception that Joyce McConnell was forced out with no transparency on either front.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Law degree; somewhat familiar with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Have not held a faculty position or been in a research role so will not understand the needs.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Do not feel that Amy is the correct choice for president. She is a fake person and cares about her own agenda. She does provide an inclusive or welcoming presence or culture. She would not change the culture at CSU and in fact, make it worse.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU and the CSU system. Ability to garner support for capital projects and vision for strategic planning

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of classroom or research experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I hope that Amy Parsons will continue to build the infrastructure at CSU necessary to propel our engagement, research and student-facing facilities (namely the LSC, Clark and hopefully a new on-campus pool).

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am concerned with the shoulder-tap nature of this hire. No other candidates were considered/presented and no feedback was requested before she was presented as a solo finalist. I would have liked to see a true search that focused on more diversity and inclusion, as it seems no persons of color were considered for the position or given the opportunity as a finalist.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Business-minded approach to running a university. Past experience with bringing major projects online including Canvas Stadium, Todos Santos.

Candidate Weaknesses: Never been an academic or a faculty member, so lacks that experience and perspective. May be hyper-criticized or dismissed unfairly for those reasons.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Parsons seems like a logical and safe choice given past circumstances.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge about CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience as a faculty member of an institution of higher education. Ms. Parsons is now in the business of marketing beauty products. That just does not align with leading a large research institution.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please bring forward a few candidates with tried and true experience in research, teaching, administration of an institution like CSU.

Employee Classification: Personal administrativo

Candidate Strengths: Es bonita

Candidate Weaknesses: Es racista, y te trata como su sirviente. No escucha opiniones de los demas y solo busca su bebeficio personal. Es la viva imagen del white privilege people y hace muy dificial trabajar con ella. Su liderazgo esta basado en el miedo todos tememos que si no hacemos lo que dice como lo dice vamos a perder nuestro trabajo she is a bully

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Necesitamos un presidente que no desprecie a las personas que no son white privilege people. que escuche a los demas y que sepa trabajar en equipo para el beneficio de la institucion no para si misma

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Grass roots, lived experience at this institution starting as an entry-level student hourly employee. Depth and breadth of experience with Student Affairs. Academic instruction experience via SAHE program. Depth and breadth of experience in both high-level and high-visibility, front-facing institutional administration and related issues/concepts/delivery.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I find it ridiculous that there is only one finalist for this position for members of the CSU community to comment on. Although I realize this is not a democratically elected position, I believe those that will be lead by the president should have at least some say in the candidates. Putting forward only one finalist makes this commenting period a sham.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: No concerns.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We need a president who will run the operations of the university and steer this organization in the right direction. It's not uncommon for universities to have a business professional as the President, it's just uncommon for CSU. It's time for a new age.

Faculty have the Academic Provost for all of their academic-related concerns.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long history with CSU and an alum

Teaching experience

Experience with inequity reversals

Legal background

Candidate Weaknesses: No presidency experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Unfortunately, we are only presented with one candidate. In future, being presented with at least two candidates as a consistent measure with all other searches done across campus would be an equitable practice.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: She lacks an academic background. Her teaching / research experience is non-existent. Her experience working with faculty, researchers, AP, undergraduate students, graduate students, residents, ect. is lacking. How will she lead when Colorado State University mission is teaching, research and service.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: She is an unacceptable candidate.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU in particular

Candidate Weaknesses: Not an academic; hasn't been in higher education for a few years; not the progressive change in leadership we need

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: There has to be another candidate out there that isn't just Tony Frank's friend/preference. I'd be shocked to know that there aren't more qualified individuals interested in this position.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU alum, understands and embraces our mission, history of organizational operational success, current donor

Candidate Weaknesses: Limited to no experience with two of her largest constituents - students and faculty, presentation style does not inspire confidence in her ability to lead the FC campus

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Significant reservations about Ms. Parsons' candidacy

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Why is CSU continuing to hire Tony's army? We need new talent, fresh ideas, and to stop churning the same people in leadership positions...Rick, Lise, Brett Anderson, etc.

Amy's idea of salary equity was a flop...does she really think that was a strength/success?
Nothing on her bio was impressive and screamed change and success.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: this feels pretty typical that we ousted every leader that was came from outside the CSU system and now our one and only candidate is someone from inside the CSU system. Are you just not trying to bring in new perspectives/thoughts or have you decided to stop pretending that you care about outside perspectives and thoughts?

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long history of connection to CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of formal teaching a research experience. Long history of connection to CSU. Will this candidate move CSSU in a new forward thinking direction? based on the history it will be more of the same no innovation in leadership.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Why are there not multiple finalists? This is unacceptable.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU alum

Past CSU leadership

Candidate Weaknesses: Work in the DEI space

No educational experience (teaching full time)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Contest her hiring. When she worked for the university previously she climbed her way to the top by stepping on those that helped her get there. She pretentious and I don't think she represents the current student body.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU system; and experience leading own business outside of education. Her support of CSU and her knowledge as a student through her work in the CSU system -- we won't find a stronger candidate for Colorado State University than Amy Parsons and I look forward to her arrival on campus as our President.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: I know Amy Parsons to be a visionary, a big thinker with big ideas for CSU. She is intelligent, and experienced, and will make a good leader.

Candidate Weaknesses: Could be friendlier to those she doesn't know. She will need to open up and be more inclusive in order to connect with students and the campus community.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Great choice, thank you!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Extensive knowledge of CSU from a variety of operational levels, including student and chancellor office-level experience.

Excellent communication skills and able to represent university well to a variety of audiences.

Extensive knowledge of the university budget.

Collaborative

Strong commitment to CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Experience is running large scale organization and familiarity with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Unclear commitment to DEI, hate crime prevention, and sexual assault issues. Ya know, our biggest issues.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Faculty barely knows how to teach let alone run a university. You are the most represented worker group on campus. Calm down.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of Education/Research experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: How does CSU expect things to change if they hire a Tony Frank lackey without any experience in Higher Ed/Research?

This choice seems to say fundraising/profit is the role of our land grant institution...why just not name a her the CEO?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Track record in previous job was not that great.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: In her previous leadership time at CSU, I did not see much creativity, flexibility, or awareness of issues, particularly with research heavy programs. Given that performance, it is odd that she's being offered an effective promotion.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This process is absolutely disappointing, that there is only ONE FINAL Candidate. We have been left in the dark and it is getting old on campus that we continue to hire and fire people with a payout because of the poor decision process. It does feel like the good "ole" boys club again and again.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: She is not been a faculty member. She has not taught, written grants, done research, etc. She does not have the experience to understand what it take to be a successful faculty member.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We should be doing a search for the best candidates, not someone who Tony can control and do what he wants.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU Experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Socioeconomic privilege and the perception of privilege are already creating distance from the person. I do believe this perception and actuality can be improved with committed personal effort to be present, listen, and concrete action on AP salaries. We are not the 'other.'

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Connection to CSU Culture

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of Academic, Research and Grant Process for a Land Grant University OR any University

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please consider the nature of our overall work and although Amy has legal expertise, these do not carry over to the academic and research work across the colleges. thank you

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Business acumen, CSU history on the administrative side, an alum who seems to care very much about the institution. Strategic and budgetary experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience on the academic, student affairs, enrollment side. No demonstrated experience in public policy around higher education.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU, including operational leadership, capital project oversight, legal expertise.

Candidate Weaknesses: Limited faculty experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think Ms. Parsons could have an immediate impact by moving existing initiatives forward and maintaining the culture and excellence already in place at CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Unknown. I never received the candidates resume, cover letter, credentials, etc.

Candidate Weaknesses: Unknown. I never received the candidates resume, cover letter, credentials, etc.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: When reviewing and/or nominating candidates did members of the CPC, APC, student body, and COWINS have a seat at the table?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: 16 years of experience at CSU in General Counsel, VPUO and the CSU System.

CSU Alum

CSU Parent

Successful entrepreneur and CEO of private international company

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I believe Amy will bring fresh energy, wisdom, as well as a host of CSU experience that will be vital to her leadership.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: JD

Candidate Weaknesses: No education experience. CSU is a University, not a business. Leadership should reflect this.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Parsons is an awful choice. CSU has clearly been on a path to turn the school into a money making enterprise since Penley. Maybe we can find someone who won't be a Tony Frank puppet?

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: History/affiliation with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: History/affiliation with CSU

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I'm too new at this institution to comment. However, it does seem like my colleagues are pretty sour about the decision making process. Wish us normal people were sole finalists in our interviews -- it'd be less stressful!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The misogyny aimed towards Amy Parsons on CSU student-run social media such as colostatememes and barstoolcsu on Instagram is unreal. I hope that somebody on her team keeps an eye on this and addresses it as unacceptable. If you are unaware of it, I suggest you look it up.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Her knowledge and experience with and at CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: I'm not sure, but maybe the fact that she has been attached to CSU in the past, would result in a lack of change.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: On appearance, Amy is a good candidate. She seems to have the knowledge and experience to be the University President.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of the CSU System

Candidate Weaknesses: No faculty experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Here we go again- what happened to the last President we had, who was also a lawyer with no Faculty experience? This is not an excellent choice, and unfortunately supports the trend of the commodification of higher education.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU, focus on students, business mindset, experience in higher ed

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I believe that even though Amy does not have a teaching or research background, she will make a great President and that we can hire a Provost with a strong background in teaching and research.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Prior experience at CSU, understanding of the University, working relationships

Candidate Weaknesses: None known at the moment

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is, unfortunately, interesting that the prior President, a female woman of color, is pushed out and her replacement is a white female who is attractive. That is all.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Leadership experience

Candidate Weaknesses: In the circle of existing leadership. Nepotism? Not sure, but clearly part of the existing regime.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The lack of a PhD should not disqualify any candidate. What we need is a good leader and they come with all sorts of letters after their name, or none!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Strong Agriculture and Extension background. Familiar with CSU administration and in general.

Candidate Weaknesses: Do not see any weaknesses.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I commend the Board of Governors for this selection and trying to get CSU back to good relations with rural Colorado and the agriculture industry.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy comes ready to hit the ground running. She knows the University, is committed to the growth of CSU and will do a great job.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has not held a position outside of Colorado.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think Amy will do a great job and is what CSU needs in a time of rebuilding and healing.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Dedicated, energetic, decision-maker, long history with CSU, strong business skills, consensus-builder, well respected. CSU is fortunate to have Amy as the finalist.

Candidate Weaknesses: None

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy is a rock star! Staff on campus have a high level of confidence in her leadership skills.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: experience with CSU culture

Candidate Weaknesses: no experience in research or education mission
track record of investments that are losing money (athletics, todos santos)
does not manage inclusively.....prone to cronyism

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: cant imagine passing up a former governor for this candidate!!

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU history, the good/bad, alumni, prior employment in system, invested in university as having family attending, has outside real world experience outside of academia.

Candidate Weaknesses: na

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Do not feel that not being a teacher/researcher makes a candidate not qualified.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of ACADEMIC experience with CSU

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Listen around -- I feel there is some inconformity, which could be due to people missing listening sessions, or not hearing enough from search committee. Making that information more present could help.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Strategy, business/entrepreneurship, familiarity with the university, professional presence

Candidate Weaknesses: Non-academic or research background

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy's most important hire will be the Provost. Suggest a comprehensive national search that includes extensive faculty involvement.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Strong familiarity with the University. Long experience with higher education with extensive executive experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has been outside of higher ed for a few years.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: In my nearly two decades at the University, I haven't heard a disparaging comment about her.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: familiarity with CSU

commitment to CSU

she is a leader and a strategist

Candidate Weaknesses: faculty understating

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: No one is going to perfect. Please focus your attn on the Provost and what they will bring to the table. we need someone with a business mindset at this time

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Concerned if she can relate to her stakeholders.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: My biggest concern is her existing relationship with Tony Frank. I am concerned about her ability to work for CSU stakeholders rather than being a tool to further Frank's agenda. Will she fight for CSU?

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: The candidate has a long history with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate does not have experience as a faculty member, nor does the candidate have experience in research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Whether true or not, there is an appearance that the search had a pre-determined candidate in mind.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She is a friend of Tony Frank's

Candidate Weaknesses: She has very limited teaching and no research experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This feels like the BOG just hired their friend, the process was not transparent and it is hard to understand how she is the best candidate to be a finalist.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Financial background, personal and professional connection to CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Not a strong academic or research background

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am surprised after hearing people talk in my listening session that the Board of Governors choose someone from outside of academia.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Very bright, wicked smart, innovative, works extremely well with the chancellor, a rising star

Candidate Weaknesses: She has little direct experience in academics, teaching, research, academic administration. Hiring a very strong Provost would help with this issue.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Has solid history of partnerships that benefitted university.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate might struggle to get support from faculty and those that had prior experience with her.

controversial projects under her radar hurt her reputation like Todos Santos.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Alignment with Tony Frank's vision; administrative facility; love of and connection to CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Alignment with Tony Frank's vision; lack of national presence; uncertainty regarding fundraising abilities and ability to provide visionary leadership

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Business management

Candidate Weaknesses: Never have taught and does not have an academic background.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I find it difficult to believe that after doing a NATIONAL search, that Amy is your choice. It's clearly an inside job directed by Tony Frank.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Longevity and connection with the university within multiple roles.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of diversity. BIPOC students and staff may have a difficult time connecting and feeling that their voices and needs are being heard and understood.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knows the campus, operations, CSU Alum, direction of Land Grant, TEAM approach.

Candidate Weaknesses: Hasn't done research, but is knowledgeable enough to understand.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy is a STRONG finalist and will be a FANTASTIC addition to the institution.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Institutional knowledge - length of service with organization

Candidate Weaknesses: Academic experience -i.e. teaching, research

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am open to this person being our leader and will support whatever decision the Board of Governors comes up with.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Problem solver. Various roles at CSU that are relevant. High achiever. Shown dedication and commitment to CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please don't let her lack of teaching experience get in the way. She is a strong leader for this role.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: knowledge of CSU

knowledge of the state of Colorado

has the support of system leadership

Candidate Weaknesses: inexperience with academics, access, admissions, advancement, athletics

reputation as a supervisor, leader and colleague

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: '-Knowledge of CSU

-Trust of Tony Frank and Board

-Leadership skills and past leadership positions

Candidate Weaknesses: '-Lack of knowledge of academic side of CSU

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: If she has the trust of Tony and the board, she will be successful.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Experience within CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of faculty or research experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I believe that an experienced executive leader with faculty experience from another research-oriented university would be a more appropriate choice.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Alumna. Ties to CSU. She is not another white man.

Candidate Weaknesses: No direct higher education employment experience. She also seems to be benefitting from cronyism - with strong ties to existing system-level leadership

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She knows CSU at many levels from multiple perspectives/roles.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: What did Joyce McConnell do to deserve termination? And how will the next President of CSU not repeat mistakes from previous administrations?

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Certainly not a very diverse pick, but not surprising. CSU is all talk about its DEISJ efforts.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Consider why this person was truly picked among all the vastly applicable candidates.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She will be fantastic. She knows how the University operates from the ground up.

Candidate Weaknesses: None to speak of.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy is an excellent choice. I believe the University will do very well under her leadership.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with some administrative aspects of CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with academics nor with research. Does not have a PhD.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I believe more time should be taken to find a qualified candidate.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: History at CSU, Success at CSU, Passion for CSU, DRIVE!

Candidate Weaknesses: Biz vs academics. But what do we need now?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: She is part of the culture and should meld into the current environment well.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She knows most aspects of the University because of prior experience here, relatively no learning curve.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think it's a great choice and the University needs some stability

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU

Will continue the mission forward

Is a woman

Understands the importance of inclusion and diversity

Candidate Weaknesses: Has been with CSU a long time

Fresh ideas may be lacking

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of relevant experience outside of CSU administration; has benefited from current system and processes that have created inequities

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Leadership and business experience, alumna, parent of a csu student, invested in CSU success, historical and institutional knowledge and relationships built

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Seems to be involved in CSU already.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic background and no research background.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy Parsons doesn't seem to have the experience to run a University.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Business and legal experience; closely allied with system office & Chancellor.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic background; business experience is limited/ not distinguishing

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU systems, leadership

Candidate Weaknesses: Diversity

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Was there diversity in the candidate pool? Ms. Parsons is the first and only candidate I've heard about.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It honestly feels fishy that there are no public forums for folks to meet this candidate. It feels like the university is rushing through this process..

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long history with CSU showing a vested interest in the community.

Candidate Weaknesses: She is a little too far to the political left than what is best for the future of CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU systems and processes. Brings diversity to a traditionally male role.

Candidate Weaknesses: Potential of having an entrenched perspective. Non-academic

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: She was Vice Chancellor and has the confidence of the head honcho. That's all that really matters.

She grew up in 4H.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not "from" the school.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: n/a

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Connection to CSU. Experience in CSU system.

Candidate Weaknesses: Being so ingrained in CSU for so long as the candidate has been might mean a lack of innovation.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of academic experience, part of the team that creates the culture we are trying to overcome. A tiny Frank “yes man”

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Deep experience with CSU. Love for CSU. Extremely smart. Well connected in CO.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The BOG should approve her appointment as President.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with University environment, has held several positions at CSU, parent of CSU student

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic or research experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Long history with CSU Fort Collins and the System.

Candidate Weaknesses: A *possible* lack of understanding of the academic side of the university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU and the CSU System.

Candidate Weaknesses: Limited, if any, professional experience at any other institutions of higher education.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Frank's puppet - just as she was in her earlier years at CSU
ZERO research experience at a RESEARCH institution

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Lengthy tenure with CSU.

Admirable accomplishments at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Non- Ph.D.,

Lacking research background.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Amy has history with CSU and Colorado, both administratively.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy has not been a faculty member herself.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: 1

Candidate Weaknesses: No research experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: How can a R1 university be led by someone with no research/teaching experience

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of focus on DEI

Lack of faculty experience

Lack of student affairs knowledge

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU experience as an alum and former employee will mean vested interest in CSU and familiarity

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Intimate knowledge of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Intimate knowledge of CSU

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Have only heard negative comments about her

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: seems like CSU system office is giving preference to a former colleague from their old regime

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU experience

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I would have liked to have some other candidates to evaluate her against.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: I am troubled by this candidate's lack of academic teaching and research experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of and care for CSU as a community, history of positive change within CSU

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Extensive variety of experience at CSU. Great business experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: None

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Hire her.

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Non-transparent, secretive process. Only one finalist of three announced is odd.

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: CSU Alumna

Served on the board for CSU

CEO and manager of a large company

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Would like more information regarding her business management successes

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: extensive experience at CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: as no background in teaching or research

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge and experience at CSU; Business Acumen; Higher Ed Politics

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Understands CSU systems and already has many contacts at CSU

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Keen understanding of the csu system

Candidate Weaknesses: None

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: A great candidate

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Law degree and business knowledge

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic background

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU, CSU Systems, CSU Extension and 4-H

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Does not have a background in academia and research

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with campus operations.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: Has CSU background and knowledge

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Administrative Professional

Candidate Strengths: I support this 100%!

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She worked here

Candidate Weaknesses: She is not qualified.

The appointment smacks of nepotism

She has never been a faculty member

She has never had to go through promotions in rank or a tenure decision.

Her work with the budget when she was here was not impressive.

CSU has culture issues surrounding women and minorities, she was part of the leadership team while these issues were present and persisted, she did not play a role in improving these issues during her tenure, so why would that be different now?

The way Joyce McConnell was kicked out was a pattern that is f

Her letter showed no vision, no clear plan for the direction she sees for CSU other than telling us what work she did while she was here.

If she was so committed to CSU why did she leave to go be a beauty product entrepreneur?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I absolutely do not support this candidate

1. Let me start by saying that a group of female faculty predicted he would choose Amy Parsons the week that Joyce McConnel was kicked out. The fact that Tony Frank feels the need to include propaganda statements in the announcement email, and then a propaganda story in source about what a great search this was, tells me, that they realized this search was tainted, and feared faculty would not take this well and tried to get ahead of it by sharing these feel good, say nothing stories. I will admit that these made me even more skeptical of the process. If a process is actually transparent, which this was not, there is no need for all the propaganda to try to convince us this was a legitimate search. But when a group of faculty who have been involved in CSU leadership KNOW before the search even starts who the winner will be, the

signs are not good. And it is NOT that we thought she was by far the best candidate that made us so sure.

2. Although Rick Miranda told a rosy story of how transparent this search was, because after all we were allowed to submit questions that the committee then asked the candidates, without out anyone else on campus getting to hear the answers, this was a completely nontransparent process. Nobody but a hand-picked committee had any information about any of the applicants, we were never able to compare their qualifications, nor hear their answers to questions, nor hear their vision. Nor know who they were so would make decisions for ourselves. When new department chairs, and deans are chosen the faculty interview the finalists, and have input. Why would this be different for the most important position at the university? Frankly, the letter Amy Parsons submitted doesn't mention any of the important things we do at the university, most egregiously teaching, nor research. She shared no vision for how CSU will improve teaching, nor maintaining our excellent research. And that is because she has zero experience in these areas, you cannot discuss what you do not understand. And to have a president who has zero experience in the most basic things we do, is unacceptable. Rick had the audacity to say that it would be our job as faculty to teach her what she needed to know, while simultaneously saying she was the best candidate because she knows us and would be ready to hit the ground running, which is clearly not true.

3. I was on the original committee on the status of women faculty at CSU, so I know firsthand the many issues that CSU has with both female and minority faculty. As president Tony Frank convened an external evaluation committee to look deeper into those issues. I was one of the faculty members that was asked to meet with the committee. We expressed to this committee the long standing, entrenched cultural issues that exist at CSU that the administration was a large part of propagating. Our upper administration was a good old boys club, and when females got into leadership roles they were not treated well. I observed this firsthand in my work with female colleagues who replaced males in their administrative positions only to lose much of the power, budget and support the male colleagues had. xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx I am sad to say that I have seen no improvement in the culture at CSU in all that time. The way Joyce was treated, was exactly the issue I saw over, and over again. After meeting with senior female faculty, the external committee was never heard from again, and things continued on as always at CSU.

The way that Joyce McConnell was treated was not a surprise to female faculty who were involved in the discussions with the external evaluation committee. She came in right in time for a pandemic and was removed without giving her a chance to prove what she could do under better circumstances. At a large cost financially to the university at a time when faculty are having to empty their own trash, vacuum our own offices, take care of our own scantrons, deal with run down classrooms, old technology that barely works, insufficient support for classroom service and IT because the university is having financial problems. It was the same old same old, nothing had changed. I feel like the committee felt that we needed a female candidate to prove we weren't as sexist as we appeared to be. But much like the Herschel Walker candidacy, the women of this campus want a qualified female candidate. Not any old female

will do, and she quite frankly is an insult to those of us who achieved academic credentials and have gone through all the things a university requires to achieve promotion and tenure and move into leadership roles.

During faculty council Rick Miranda made light of these concerns saying when he moved into a dean position, he needed to learn about the other departments etc. That was a ridiculous response to our legitimate concerns about her qualifications. He may have had to learn about the new departments, but he had to go through the process everyone he was making decisions on and for did. He understood the basic system, she does not.

Amy Parson was part of Tony Frank's leadership team during all this time and did nothing to improve the climate, so I have no doubts that she is NOT the solution to the cultural issues at CSU. We needed new blood, and I have heard from people involved in the search that were other great applicants that we as a university didn't even get to hear about or give feedback on. Again, the lack of transparency was breathtaking. This is what happened when Joyce McConnell was hired as well, but at least she was a qualified candidate who was a full professor from another university. So, to have no transparency, and such a poor choice of candidates emerge as the sole candidate the university gets to meet, is too much to bear.

This question was asked quite eloquently at the faculty council meeting (by a woman whose name I did not catch), "CSU has a hard time attracting, but more importantly retaining faculty of color, because we have a culture problem. How is having a person who has been part of the leadership team that has not addressed, nor improved these issues helping us move forward? And how is this not nepotism?" Rick Miranda failed to even address these questions, just saying over and over that he was confident she would do a good job. His confidence is not shared by many of us on this campus.

4. Rick Miranda talked at faculty council about her experience managing our budgets. I have to say, I have been highly unimpressed the last 10 years or so with our budgeting of money for important classroom services. As I stated before I am teaching in dilapidated rooms, with really old, barely functioning technology, and inadequate classroom services support. I heard there are only 3 people to handle IT issues in classrooms for the entire university. I in no way blame classroom services, this is 100% lack of adequate support for important services necessary to carry out our most important functions, by the administration. Before the pandemic I taught in a room where the technology was so bad my students requested, I try to find a new room. Which there were none available. Therefore, I am not impressed with her work with the budget, and I do not share Rick Miranda's view that she did a great job. Therefore, I am concerned about that if she becomes president that the situation will continue to deteriorate, particularly as she has no academic qualifications, has never taught a class, and dealt with trying to get a 10-year-old computer (and that is real) to function while 80 students wonder what is wrong with you that the technology never works. I am a full professor and a UDTS so it is not as detrimental to me as a Jr faculty member who will get bad reviews because

of issues that are beyond their control and are functions that university has a duty to take care of.

5. The biggest issue in my mind is her complete lack of experience doing anything faculty do. She hasn't taught undergraduate or graduate courses while trying to maintain a research/scholarship enterprise, while juggling service commitments. How can she be a leader in improving undergraduate education, when she has no idea about the skill sets and support necessary to carry out these functions? How can she improve our research endeavors when again she has never tried to do any of this work herself? She has never had to write an academic publication; she has never gone through a promotion process let alone a tenure decision. She is not qualified for this position.

In summary, CSU has some serious and entrenched issues around equity for both female faculty and faculty of color. Amy Parsons has no record of helping to improve any of these. She is not the right choice to help us improve and be different, she is looking backwards, not forwards. She outlined no clear plan for the directions she thinks CSU should pursue. This search was not transparent and is a continuation of bad patterns. I believe the campus has a right to know who the finalists are, interview them and have input into the selection. Without this, it is a secret process that is suspect.

For all these reasons, I cannot, and do not support her as the sole candidate.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She is a CSU booster and alum. She has a positive reputation with business leaders in the state.

Candidate Weaknesses: You said that, "we want a unifying and inspiring leader." Amy Parson is as far from that as you could get. On social media, we can see that she has positive reputation with business leaders in Colorado. However, her selection further solidifies the reputation that Chancellor Frank continues to operate the "old boys club". Whether this is true or not actually doesn't matter. In this case, it will take years for Parsons to develop respect among the faculty, given that she did not inspire it in her previous roles as VP of Operations and Vice Chancellor.

Lack of qualifications:

- 1) she was not qualified for the role of VP of Operations and got that role because she worked well with Tony. Having been the deputy general council, does not qualify her in any way to be a Vice President overseeing units with which she has no experience or insight or interest in supporting or improving.
- 2) She was dismissive of faculty and lacking courage to lead. I met with her on three occasions to discuss ways that various programs/office under the VP of Operations could improve for the benefit of the university. In each of those conversations, I was invited to bring forward and discuss opportunities for addressing university challenges. In response, she said some variety of this "I don't have any specific experience in that realm (e.g. finances/budget, facilities, risk management) and so I don't feel confident in suggesting any changes to current practices." This kind of dismissive response indicates that she is inexperienced lacks the courage to lead and to tackle challenging topics.
- 3) Leaving CSU to be the CEO of an online, beauty products, import company with very few employees does not qualify her to manage a university facing serious financial challenges. She knows how to make money in a corporate setting, she does not know how to coalesce and inspire people and make tough decisions in a public institution.
- 4) She has no experience as a faculty, a dean, a provost or any leadership position that would qualify her to manage the variety of responsibilities of a President.
- 5) while she was able to list the challenges facing the university, she has not demonstrated in her past work any ability to inspire, coalesce, or work with staff and faculty to tackle tough challenges.

Poor execution of her duties:

- 1) I was called in to offer advice and suggestions in the early stages of the Todos Santos project. She was again dismissive, after inviting me to a meeting, and indicated that best practices I recommended for the project were "uncomfortable" and "challenging" and she couldn't see a way to integrate them. She did not ask, how can we meet these challenges?, what can we do differently?, she just asked for my expert advice and then said, "I don't see how that

can help." The point of inviting me to the table is because I do have the experience, and I do know that it can be done, and it can help.

This meeting was the fourth strike for me. I have worked with many administrators at CSU who do take my advice seriously and do look for ways to address challenges. I have no experience with Parsons that indicates to me that she can be an inspiring or coachable leader.

2) Beyond my own unproductive interactions with her, I have heard numerous stories of how all the capital projects she led were mismanaged, inefficient, and alienating to a variety of on and off-campus experts and leaders.

I think the journalists got it right, "Parsons is embarrassingly underqualified."

Lack of respect and authority:

Despite having been at this university for years, prior to her being named candidate for President, I had four co-workers and supervisees come to my office to express concern and give me a heads up that they will likely resign within a year if Amy Parsons becomes the President. In my decades at this university, I have NEVER had faculty or staff preemptively in my office letting me know that they are planning their exit strategy because of their lack of respect for a potential candidate.

Faculty are tired and exhausted and have no interest in "educating" Parsons about the academic issues that she has no experience with. My own past experience tells me that she is neither interested or capable of learning from faculty and is either unwilling or too uncertain to take on risks and new challenges. Four unproductive meetings for me is four strikes. As a leader in this university, I am uncertain that there is any action she could take that would convince me that she is knowledgeable enough or willing to actually lead.

Lack of independence from Chancellor Frank:

You all know the joke around campus, "If you are not a 'friend of Tony' you won't advance at CSU." Amy is perceived across campus and across the country as "Tony's girlfriend". Her candidacy has already harmed the reputation of our institution and it will likely take years to repair the reputational harm that has been done by advancing a candidate that is seen at CSU and by our peer institutions as being unqualified.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I have heard from people that I respect that this process was robust and that Parsons gave an excellent interview. I am inclined to believe them.

Here is what you don't know:

1) In the last month, I have had conversations with vice presidents at four of our peer institutions who let me know that Joyce being fired sent the message to the entire academic

community that Tony is still at the reigns of CSU and that no President will be allowed to act independently from him or the Board. I was asked point blank, by a leader from another institution, "'Which 'Friend of Tony' will be appointed the next President?'"

The damage to our reputation started when Joyce was let go without explanation after she saw us successfully through a pandemic. The selection of Amy Parson solidifies the public perception that she is simply "'Tony's girl'". Whether this is true or not, the reputational damage is already done, and she has little chance of gaining respect from our peer institutions.

I have not spoken to a single faculty member who is inspired by Amy Parsons, who respects her as a leader, or who believes she has the qualifications to lead our institution. On the contrary, I spent the weekend on the phone listening to the concerns of colleagues from nearly every college on campus, expressing concern and worry over the future of our institution.

2) The selection of Parsons does inspire or unify faculty who are tired of Tony's "'old boy network'", favoritism, and investment in select programs rather than the whole institution. No amount of press releases from the search committee will create any faith in the fairness of this process. Faculty are tired and disheartened that Parsons will NOT even have the authority, respect, and power to address any of the tough issues facing faculty.

3) CSU has been struggling to retain talented women faculty. Within my department, three are now considering leaving--because of this nomination. As one of a tiny handful of female full professors in my department, I have been encouraged to accept an outside offer if I want my own career to advance. With Parsons as the President, I expect to see an acceleration of the departure of our most talented women researchers from the Assistant to the Full Professor levels. If that occurs, it will take a decade to recover the lost talent. This selection indicates to all faculty that we will have a lame duck as President for the next five or more years.

4) If you want a unifying President, it can't be someone who has been promoted by and closely aligned with Tony. These issues have been the talk on campus since Joyce was fired, but they would never make it into the public record through "'listening sessions'". Most senior faculty told me "'why would I bother to attend any of those sessions, when we know that it is all just a show. Tony and the Board are not actually interested in faculty opinion, and I have too much work to do to waste my time in a process that won't matter in the end.'" Despite your best efforts to vet qualified candidates, you managed to select the one person seen as least qualified by staff and faculty alike.

5) We are searching for new faculty this fall and have had our SIX top candidates turn us down over salaries, cost of living, and uncertainty over the leadership at this institution. We may be facing multiple failed faculty searches this year--which has never happened in our history. Is Parsons prepared to turn that around with a multi-million \$ budget shortfall? Does Parsons have even a vague idea what it would take to build respect among the faculty? Does CSU want to

remain a competitive R1 university? Does Parson have any idea what kind of support and investments are required to support research faculty?

Tired and disheartened, Full Professor

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons has a shockingly thin resume of accomplishments to lead an internationally recognized higher education institution. As discussed at Faculty Council, she obviously has never done any of the core academic work of the university of teaching or research. (Her announcement notably references her brief stint sharing her professional experience in a master's level course which was co-taught by an actual faculty member; this is an experience not far beyond what might be accomplished by a mid-level manager in a local business.) She has not developed degree programs, interrogated instructional strategies, advised students, written a grant, answered a research question, or published a paper. And she shows no evidence of understanding these things at all, no vision for how to take this place to excellence. Her materials only show a lovely nostalgia for her alma mater, but nothing that suggests she has any innovative ideas of where to go in the future.

Her qualification relies, then, on her experience as an executive. For the past two years she has been the CEO of a small startup that imports Italian beauty products. In her materials she does not point to even one accomplishment in that time period. Businesses are run by numbers - what are hers? What sales and revenue did she bring in? Did she turn a profit? How many people work for her? What does she have to show for this job? How does this relate to running a billion-dollar university? Or, has she been a failure as a CEO of a fledgling company, and the BOG is just glossing over that?

Most of her announcement as finalist, as well as her cover letter (which is twice as long as her C.V.), touts her experience as an administrator at CSU. She was hired as a CSU lawyer after working as outside counsel. She was then promoted 3 times - all without a search: she was named as Deputy GC, VP for Operations, and EVC all without an open, competitive, national search. As VPO and EVC, it is not clear at all what her qualifications were for those jobs. If you listen to people who worked for and with her, she was not only unqualified, she was also largely incompetent, settling into doing symbolic work of networking and external relations, rather than actually knowing how to operate or lead anything in her divisions. In naming her as a finalist to be CSU's president, did the BOG look at any feedback from her former direct reports, staff in her divisions, or peers on what they thought about her skills or leadership? Other than taking Tony Frank's word for it, was there any due diligence conducted?

Perhaps the board is relying on what she touts as her great accomplishments: the construction of the campuses of Todos Santos and Spur, as well as Canvas Stadium. The state of Colorado has been generous in construction funds, and subsidies from excess revenues from CSU Global give the board play money to seed such projects. But for these to be actual accomplishments, don't they need a plan for success, especially since Global is recently tanking? Todos Santos has been bleeding university funding since its inception over a dozen years ago - costing the university millions in development and operations - and still has not had a year in the black. A

plan for it to be fiscally successful was only developed after Parsons left, and still has not yet been successful. Canvas Stadium, similarly, costs the university's general fund millions every year in subsidies for its construction bond and operations, and still has no realistic chance of operating profitably. Perhaps scariest of all, there is absolutely no plan on how the university will pay for the operations of the Spur Campus - millions per year - in the future. She helped build a glorified children's museum, with some expensive and flashy spaces, requiring startup funds larger than the annual general budgets of any of our colleges. These three examples are not alone, as she was VPO or EVC overseeing other boondoggles like the Translational Medicine Institute and the Engagement Hubs that are supposed to have income to help run them, but have also been fiscal failures.

Even her office as EVC is suspect, as the millions of dollars to run the 'system' office has ballooned astronomically over the past decade. (When the other 'system' campuses are something smaller than any one of Fort Collins' colleges and something that is nearly completely independently operated, a large 'system' office makes little sense). How has she justified the huge growth in system staff? What are the outcomes and benefits of this growth?

So, if Parsons is fit to lead the entire university, what about this record? What did she promise the BOG at the inception of these projects as far as their fiscal plan? What did she see as measures of their success? And how does she explain the failures to meet those successes? The board may be very uncomfortable facing the reality that their pet project of Spur is a spurious bet, but doubling down on it by hiring a president who seems to have no idea how to fix it puts the institution at even greater long-term risk.

Worse yet, these kinds of projects have come with enormous local problems for affected community members, showing her disregard or incompetence in issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion. In addition to the scandal with the Todos Santos developer, the local Mexican community has been reportedly outraged by the promises made by CSU of involving and serving local community members that have not been met. The same is happening in the neighborhoods around Spur, where throwing out a very small local scholarship is somehow supposed to mitigate the enormous impact on the community. And of course the stadium has been a community mess for Fort Collins from the beginning. As evidence that she clearly doesn't get it: Parsons oversaw and was featured in the tone-deaf pictorial spread in State magazine, with a double-page Vanity Fair style layout of a bunch of young, long-haired white women running Spur, without any understanding of how disgusting that must have looked to the people of color who have lived in that area for generations.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

It may be fun for board members to go to ribbon cuttings in support of Tony Frank's vanity projects. But real leadership comes from how to run a university for the long term, how to meet its mission and obligations to its students, faculty, staff, and community. Her paltry executive record, for what it is, has been nothing more than siphoning money from the core of the university - starving academics and operations - for glittery projects with no sustainability plan. The reason the university can't afford to pay non-tenure track faculty and staff a living wage is

because Amy Parsons helps Tony Frank to pull money away from the core of the university to fund dubious projects. Hiring her would be a shocking failure of the Board of Governors' fiduciary and public duties.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Hiring Amy Parsons would continue a history of the Board of Governors supporting mafia-style hiring practices that are contrary to everything a university should be about. The BOG seems to believe fealty to Tony Frank is the singular qualification for executive administration at CSU, rather than competence. At university, the president/chancellor is not actually a CEO. Instead, our aspirant institutions that rank better than CSU are led by individuals who understand their role as the head of a complex institution that is made better by the open debate of conflicting ideas, who value the role of faculty in shared governance, who are not threatened by leaders who are at the top of their fields.

By contrast, the BOG has supported Frank's pattern of appointing a large number of executives who have prior relationships with him and who do not hold appropriate credentials for their positions. While any one appointment may be the luck of finding an extraordinary leader with an uncommon background, the pattern is strong enough that the university's reputation for merit over loyalty is at risk, and confidence in the BOG's ability to scrutinize these appointments has vanished. Some examples:

- Amy Parsons was named vice president for operations with no experience in fiscal affairs, facilities, public safety, or human resources without an open search. She was later promoted to executive vice chancellor without an open search. We are now asked to believe that serving as the CEO of a new beauty products company makes her more qualified to be CSU's president than all of the sitting presidents and provosts who applied for the job.

- Parsons was followed as VPO by Lynn Johnson, who does not hold a graduate degree, was appointed without an open search and did not work in Operations. She was later appointed as vice president of CSURF without an open search.

- Johnson was followed by the newest VPO, who has never worked at a university but who served on the National Western board with Frank.

- Brett Anderson was hired as VP for Advancement with no professional fundraising experience, and later was named interim VP for Human Resources with no professional human resources experience.

- Lou Swanson was hired as VP for Engagement with no experience in extension or online programs. Reporting to him, Kathy Rennels, a former elected official who never worked at a

university and has no college degree, was hired as associate vice president without a search and was later named interim vice president of engagement and extension.

-Leslie Taylor was hired as VP for Enrollment and Access with no experience in admissions, financial aid, or college access.

-Pat Burns was hired as VP for Information Technology and Dean of Libraries, with no experience in IT or as a librarian. He was later promoted to the system's chief information officer, with no open search.

-Ajay Menon was hired as Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences after a search failed, with no experience in agriculture. Later, after he was not successful in his application for president, he was appointed president of CSURF without an open search and moved the reporting line from the president to the chancellor.

-Jan Nerger was appointed interim Provost despite applying to be provost and not being named by the committee as even a finalist.

By contrast, after the board fired President McConnell, five vice presidents - all hired from outside of the institution - were fired, demoted, or diminished in duties over the summer. After the president, the provost and the vice president for engagement and extension were immediately fired and returned to their faculty roles. Also immediately, work was distributed from qualified female VPs to loyalists men, with the public explanation that their work had to be reassigned due to 'competing demands' or the need to 'focus' on other responsibilities (implying that the loyal men these duties were assigned to are better equipped to juggle more work). The VP for Human Resources was going to oversee the Office of Equal Opportunity, but instead the office was reassigned to the new male VP for Operations, who admits to having no background in OEO or Title IX issues. The VP for Marketing and Communications held an interim role integrating these functions with Enrollment and Access, but instead E&A was reassigned directly to the male interim president. The Vice President for Strategy was promoted in the spring to Executive Vice President for Strategy and Administration and was to serve as the president's chief of staff, but instead these duties were reassigned to a male interim with no experience as chief of staff and the VP for S was demoted down from EVP and moved out of the president's office. All three of these VPs have since resigned.

In total, that means CSU has lost the contributions of 6 senior executives this year, with the university community being given no explanation of what these leaders were doing wrong. Faculty hear that Frank and the board did not review their performance evaluations or 360 surveys before making these decisions. The explanation offered was that the BOG wanted a 'new direction', but with record revenues from research grants, record freshman enrollments, and record donations, all despite COVID, the university has not been told what 'new direction' - other than more loyalty to Tony Frank - is required. Because Frank fired 4 vice presidents

when he was first hired as president, the CSU community has come to believe this is just how things are done, not realizing that this is not at all the case at other universities. At institutions of higher education, leaders are chosen through rigorous screening of their merits, where new ideas and tough questions are valued.

Instead, at CSU, doing good for the institution is not what is valued; instead, fealty to Tony Frank is the only thing that matters. The materials submitted by Amy Parsons provide no picture of the direction she sees. The job of the president of CSU should not be to make Tony Frank look good; the job should require the best visionary administrator possible to take this university to unimagined excellence. It's clear that Amy Parsons will not be capable of that. She probably doesn't even know what that means.

It is embarrassing for CSU that we had to put out a Source article arguing the integrity of the process. To quote Carl Sandberg: "If the facts are against you, argue the law. If the law is against you, argue the facts. If the law and the facts are against you, pound the table and yell like hell." In this case, the merits are clearly against Parsons. So CSU had to argue that the process was for Parsons. Given the history here, no one believes that. And now, if the board enters a contract with her, they are left to jump up and down and yell to make their case. This is a sham. And a shame.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity and experience with the CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: 1. Too much experience within the CSU system: An outsider would be better positioned to bring much-needed institutional change and independent leadership. For example, on Parson's CV, the first key initiative listed under her role as CSU Vice President for University Operations is the Canvas Stadium. This project was a considerable waste of public taxpayer money and a missed opportunity to invest funds elsewhere that would actually benefit the educational mission of the university. Moreover, as someone touting their accomplishments as a business executive, Canvas Stadium has, simply put, been a bad economic investment for the university. Listing the stadium as the top accomplishment during her tenure in this role demonstrates that she is unwilling to take responsibility for her poor decision-making and leadership in the past. It also reveals her inability to challenge other institutional leaders within the CSU system who envision this university to be something it simply isn't and will never be.

2. Lack of significant scholarly, research, and teaching experience: Despite executive roles within the CSU system, this candidate has never held a faculty position and thus lacks a personal understanding of a university's core mission and daily operations within departments, classrooms, labs, research centers, etc. Faculty at CSU are already paid well below the national average across the board. When cost-of-living is taken into consideration, the pay for faculty is even lower relative to other R1 institutions. In order to attract and retain world-class talent in this environment, faculty need a leader that they can get behind who embodies what it means to be in higher education and channels a higher cause. Selecting a president who lacks scholarly, research, and teaching experience signals to our current faculty, potential faculty, and academic institutions worldwide that this institution does not take scholarship seriously. It will likely add to our institution's existing challenges with hiring and retention.

3. Corporate industry experience as a CEO: The candidate's role leading a e-commerce operation is insufficient experience for leading an institution of public higher education, particularly as it relates to understanding the value of a liberal education, fostering citizens and democracy through civic education, and creating a more just and equitable society. Students and faculty will see through this applicant, whose CV does not include any meaningful diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice (DEIJ) accomplishments. For example, while claiming to care about gender equity and supporting the gender pay equity survey, this is another example where Parsons failed to accomplish what she set out to do at CSU. Faculty gender pay equity remains a substantial problem at the university, and it is a stain on her record. Moreover, the candidate lacks any mention of racial, sexuality (LGBTQ+), or disability equity initiatives, let alone accomplishments. As with Mark Kennedy at CSU Boulder, there is a substantial risk that campus action against Parsons will lead to an early separation and thus the potential for CSU to lose even more money buying out a contract of a university president. Bringing in a president who is opposed by much of the faculty and student body is extremely risky from operational, financial, and reputational standpoints.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Parsons' experience at CSU and within the CSU system did not result in any significant successes for the university, and her touted accomplishments more accurately could be characterized as failures. Further, the risk of bringing Parsons into CSU as a president also may be too high, as our institution cannot afford another failed presidency this soon after McConnell's departure. I would call upon the Board of Governors to consider carefully how they are assessing the risk of this choice, particularly the probability that she will earn enough support from faculty and students to remain in this position for her full term. Speaking as a faculty member, I have observed that faculty across this campus are extremely unhappy about this decision and likely will not be complacent.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The candidate has institutional knowledge and has previous experience with executing initiatives at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate does not hold the required and preferred academic qualifications to lead a world-class land grant university. The candidate has not shown experience in leading a higher education institution and has in no way expressed her commitment to DEISJ. While the candidate may have institutional knowledge, leading CSU will require new ideas and someone who is knowledgeable and has lived experience in teaching, research and engagement enterprises of an university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is truly very disappointing and heart breaking to see that a world-class Research 1 university could only attract one finalist. This decision is very biased and many faculty and staff already knew of this decision in the first week of President McConnell's resignation. I believe CSU is an epitome of justice and I was very proud of the institution when I joined, however, the lack of transparency in removal of President McConnell is blatant disrespect to all stakeholders of the university. I have no confidence in the Board to be able to make independent and just decisions. The Board seems to decide based on Chancellor's wishes, which brings back the thought that only the handful elite people will decide the fate of CSU. I have personally experienced Amy Parsons name being mentioned as the finalist right after President McConnell's resignation, even before the search committee formation and again several times in different settings. This shows how much of influence and decision making is solely done by the CSU Chancellor's office. If CSU really believes in our our Principles of Community and wants to act according to it, the Presidential search and decisions regarding CSU's future should be transparent. The candidate may have strengths, but to have only one finalist shows that national leaders in higher education really don't believe that CSU and Board of Governors will be inclusive and have lost faith in CSU. We yet again show to the world and our peers that CSU decisions are made by one person (have to be loyal to him), and his close elite group. If we do end up getting Amy Parsons as our President, it will seriously be harmful for faculty morale and retention. I personally was very sad about the decision and lost all faith in CSU's independent decision. We need a LEADER who can lead CSU and not a puppet manager who will need to take permissions or execute initiatives already designed. I am in no way expressing that the search committee was compromised, I am expressing that CSU's future is decided by one person, which is very unfair. Maybe, it will be easier to just announce that BOG and Chancellor's office will decide the new President versus showing a farce transparent process. This will save the emotional and mental stress that faculty and staff have to go through after the final announcement. It will also save the time and effort that the search committee members so selflessly provided. Overall, I have lost all confidence that we will have a transparent and just decision to decide the future of CSU. I am no longer proud of how we treat human beings and can just play around their careers and life. Indeed a sad experience to live through.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has a long-term connection to CSU (but so do thousands of other alumni, parents, and employees).

Candidate Weaknesses: I am deeply concerned about the Ms. Parsons' preparation to serve as president of CSU. She does not have research or teaching experience, which calls into question her ability to effectively understand and manage an R1 university. In her letter to the hiring committee, she highlights her involvement in a number of expensive projects, including the football stadium, the Todos Santos program, and the Spur campus. These projects do not directly contribute to CSU's core mission as a land grant university, and they divert much-needed resources from teaching and research. Nor is Ms. Parson's business experience particularly impressive. The "comprehensive strategic partnership agreements" she negotiated for CSU with Coca-Cola and Office Max represent the ordinary work of any large organization. Ms. Parsons writes that she is the CEO of "a fast-growing global e-commerce company," but her materials do not note the amount of revenue the firm earns, the number of employees Ms. Parsons manages, or a single innovation she has brought to the industry. While she gives lip service to "shared governance", her application materials do not describe examples of how conversations with others changed her views on issues, let alone of how formal institutions that constrain the power of CSU's President serve the interests of the University.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The lack of transparency in CSU's upper administration and its Board of Governors is troubling. Faculty, staff, and students never received a clear explanation for the removal of President McConnell, and the BoG is now hiring another candidate using the same, opaque process. Hiring committee members are carefully selected by the upper administration and forced to sign non-disclosure agreements. Faculty, staff, and students are invited to listening sessions, which are used to vaguely define the "desired characteristics" for our next president, such as being "supportive of staff" and "committed to DEI." The search then proceeded behind closed doors until the BoG surprised us last Friday that Amy Parsons is the sole finalist. I struggle to understand how her candidacy rose to the top of a "highly competitive nationwide search," and I am skeptical that someone with similar qualifications could be chosen as President at any of our peer institutions. Although the listening sessions identified "low salaries of all CSU employees" and the "high cost of attending CSU" as the largest challenges facing the next CSU President, we have received no information about how Ms. Parsons plans to address these challenges. Not a single meeting is planned for faculty, staff, and students to meet Ms. Parsons. Indeed, the BoG did not even provide an anonymous mechanism for the CSU community to share their thoughts about its choice. All of this suggests to me that even the BoG is uncertain about its chosen finalist - as it should be.

For the sake of transparency, I would like Faculty Council to make public all the comments it receives from faculty and staff.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I cannot think of any.

Candidate Weaknesses: She is not qualified for the job of President of CSU. She is not an academic and therefore does not understand academic life, how to support academics, or how to run an academic institution. Her previous associations with CSU are not academic and did not prepare her for this role. Her hiring reflects the desire of our chancellor to appoint someone who will do whatever he wants, parroting his positions to the university community and to the public.

Her experience in business, which has been over exaggerated in her letter and in the recent press pieces about her as a finalist, does not qualify her to lead an academic institution, where we do not produce profit. We do not have customers. We do not model our budget, activities, or values after a business and this should not be used as a model to find future leadership. She is not an appropriate candidate for the job and the fact that she was chosen as the result of a supposedly "national" search is an embarrassment.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: President Miranda's comments at the meeting on Dec. 6 were very frustrating, weak, and dismissive of faculty concerns. Her past work on the stadium or Todos Santos does not qualify her for this position, and the President's justification for her selection based on these was ridiculous. Also absurd was his suggestion that other research universities have been appointing non-academics as their presidents. Purdue and University of FL are hardly examples to be held up as models for our choices, as the Pres. Miranda suggested. The faculty at U. of FL have publicly and vehemently opposed the appointment of former congressman Ben Sasse as their president. We should not follow their examples by appointing a non-academic.

The current president's comments that we, the faculty and other members of the community, should see ourselves in a role to train or prepare her for this position is equally ludicrous. This is not our job. We should not hire someone who is so lacking in qualifications that we are now responsible for training her. As was asked at the meeting, will we be compensated for this extra labor?

Further, the idea that we are only now being asked to provide comments on her as a finalist is insulting. The search was not transparent, as Pres. Miranda and others claimed. The listening sessions in the fall were a joke and we have no evidence that anything shared at those sessions was considered when the candidates were reviewed.

The selection of the finalist only demonstrates what continues to be an utter lack of leadership at the top levels. This will lead to more faculty turn over, as we see that our labor is not valued.

Truly it is confusing why we have Pres. Miranda attend and present at the council meetings if he is just going to repeat what Tony Frank has told him and refuse to answer our questions honestly. Other discussion would be a better use of the council's time.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: She has none of the prerequisite experience I would expect for a university president. Among Land Grant Universities, 85% rise to the president's position from faculty ranks. None of the current presidents came from a university operations background. I don't believe Amy can set a vision for the university nor hire a leadership team that would make her successful.

The recent example with Spur campus illustrates this point well. Amy was the lead on development of Spur from its inception in 2015 almost to the completion of construction in 2020. The entire focus of Spur during that time was on building construction. There was no systematic planning for what kind of programming was appropriate for the building. The Chancellor's Office had its pet projects it was nurturing at the system level, but really none of them are revenue generating. A number of projects came forward from Ft Collins, the general attitude was "throw ideas against the wall and see what sticks." No consideration was given to the business models for these projects. The Chancellor's Office provided seed money to all, but most are not financially sustainable. More important, there is no general theme or thrust to these activities, it's a hodge podge of stuff. Marketing has focused on this great place to bring K-12 kids for field trips (which generates no revenue) and completely ignored the economic development side of programming (which was the original intent of the facilities). In short, programming at Spur campus is a mess. They are now throwing a lot of system money at the project, but that is only a bandaid for the underlying programming issues. All this is what happens when a university puts an operations person in charge of designing a R&D project instead of placing an experienced faculty administrator at the helm. It's the programming that will make or break the Spur project. That's what we're going to get with Amy Parsons: Someone who will make sure the facilities are well taken care of but has only a poor understanding of the programming that goes into those facilities. And she's too inexperienced to figure out the team she will need to successfully run the academic side of things.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: See my previous comments.

To the Board of Governors: Please don't put CSU through what will surely be a train wreck! Please repost the position and make it clear that the potential hire will report directly to you and will be given some independence from the Chancellor's Office. People who aspire to be a university president want to be able to make a mark on the institution, to move it forward in exciting new ways. Quality folks are not going to apply if it looks like they are going to be hamstrung by a former university president who wants to maintain the status quo.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Amy Parsons would have the support of Tony Frank, something Joyce McConnell did not have.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons is not qualified for this position, hence an unacceptable candidate.

1. She was hand-picked by Tony Frank for her two administrative positions without being vetted through searches and was not well-regarded on campus by faculty.
2. She does not have an academic background and at a time where students, faculty and staff are struggling with mental health issues stemming from the pandemic she does not have the experience and insights of a faculty member to lead the university in such dire circumstances.
3. Her projects when she was VPO all ended up to be controversial and financial failures for the institution; INTO, Todos Santos, Ascend, and the Stadium.
4. She has no experience with DEI and in her administrative positions, she showed no particular interest in DEI and spoke superficially about it in her letter.
5. She did not speak to a vision for the university looking forward.
6. She is seen as taking the institution backwards to the Tony Frank days rather than taking us forward and forging a more inclusive culture.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: 1. When the announcement of a finalist for a University President position is made it generally speaks to the person's qualifications, vision, understanding of in our case of what it means to be a land-grant R1 university. The fact that the announcement was made with testimonials from members of the committee about how great the search process was is a red flag. It looks like trying to get ahead of expected criticism in a way that did not occur when Joyce McConnell was hired for example.

2. Rick Miranda couldn't even speak convincingly about her qualifications on one hand saying she was the most qualified in the pool and "knows us" and can hit the ground running and on the other hand saying that faculty will be expected to help her and teach her given her lack of experience as an academic.

3. Faculty are so scared of retaliation - both Tony Frank and Amy Parsons have a reputation for retaliating against people who don't publicly agree with them - that they are unwilling to go on the record with their concerns and hence the need for an anonymous survey.

4. Decisions like choosing Rick Miranda as Interim President and Amy Parsons as President are widely regarded as examples of nepotism, and people made predictions in both cases immediately following the firing of Joyce McConnell.

5. Despite the BOG preference for closed searches this case illustrates why they are so problematic and simply pushing through a candidate who does not have the respect and support of faculty and staff is not good for the institution or the candidate.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU; endorsement and mentorship from individuals who have demonstrated steadfast and competent leadership over CSU system. I appreciate her connection to, and investment in, our community.

Candidate Weaknesses: She hasn't "come through" the academic system in the way that a candidate who was a prof, chair, dean, etc. I worry that she will be too focused on the business-y aspects of CSU and lose sight of the whole reason, the number one reason, we are here: to teach students well and do research that makes a difference.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: They say that closed searches are the norm. They say that, for legal reasons, they can't tell us why McConnell and the board decided to part ways (or if it even was a mutual decision). They say that it's totally common to appointment a prez with limited or no academic chops. Let's take all of these things at face value. It doesn't matter. It really looks like they "ran off" an outsider and replaced her with someone who's a member of the good old boys club (albeit not a good old *boy*, which does matter). Imagine for a minute that the supreme court got rid of the president in a secret meeting and said that they couldn't tell us why. (It's not a perfect metaphor--the BOG are not SCOTUS, but bear with me). Would we really put up with that? We would be outraged by the secrecy and recognize that it's profoundly damaging in a system of shared governance to have a leader ripped away, in secret, and another appointed to replace, again in secret. Maybe we, at CSU, can get away with it a few times without too much damage. But I hope the BOG understand that it has consequences to operate in this way. It is not healthy for a community to lose a leader with no explanation, and then get another that was appointed in a closed process. There is absolutely no configuration of a closed search that can make up for this. No amount of representation on a search committee can substitute for actual, significant, substantive involvement by the community BEFORE a final candidate is selected. It's just toxic. Please don't let it poison the trust and sense of community we've worked so hard to build at CSU. As a faculty member, it really matters to me that the BOG and Chancellor and others have worked so hard to mentor competent, responsible leadership. How wonderful for us to have a "bench" of strong leaders. Let's have confidence in those leaders--if they're the best, then they will come out on top in an open, national search. I wonder what it would take to convince the BOG to commit, publicly, to an open search next time.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Evidently she is a good spokesperson/cheer leader for the university

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic background - how will she understand the issues that faculty are confronting

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Any time a job search ends with a sole finalist, this raises a giant red flag. Were there really no other qualified candidates? Giving the community no opportunity for input indicates that the perspectives of people outside the search committee is not valued, or worse that the university is trying to bypass the process of public input, knowing that their preferred candidate will not fare well.

The sudden and secretive dismissal of President McConnell already left many of us suspicious of Tony Frank and the Board of Governors. McConnell had strong credentials to become a university president and shepherded the university through the difficult pandemic years. The university community at large has no understanding of the reasons for her departure. That she is now to be replaced by a legal/business woman without an academic background gives that impression that the university in fact does not prioritize academics. In the press release, Parsons was praised for her work on Canvas Stadium and CSU SPUR. Neither of these are central to the primary educational mission of the university, yet they seem to dominate the attention and resources of the upper administration.

Many universities in our country are being run like businesses, and this corporate emphasis appears to dominate at CSU. Upper administration appears to be most concerned about their large donors and public image, making sure it doesn't alienate any conservative heavy hitters in the world of political and corporate power. As a faculty member for almost 15 years, I have never had the impression that upper administration has any understanding of the issues that faculty and students face. The university structure is incredibly hierarchical with top-heavy salaries, and the ability of those at the top to have so much control over resources makes the university seem like an autocracy whose mission is self-promotion to the business world rather than support of the faculty, staff, and students within the institution.

Although I love both the teaching and research I am able to do at CSU, I am increasingly distressed to work for an institution that does not value and support its employees. The selection of Parsons as the sole finalist for President is a classic example of the skewed priorities of CSU leadership, and it is incredibly disappointing to many of us on the faculty.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience in administration and management in private sector.

Would relate well to Colorado State Legislature and be a good advocate for CSU resource development in Colorado higher education.

Understands the budgeting process and its limitations.

Would be good at alumni development and would be effective in building university endowment.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has never held a faculty position and there is no evidence that she is familiar with what are the essential qualities of academic success. Being a former legal counsel does not qualify in terms of experience.

Where is the evidence that she understands what is necessary to create and sustain a leading research university?

Do we trust this person to be an articulate advocate for the university and its faculty in leading federal research agencies? Why, if she has no academic experience?

There is no evidence that she understands faculty governance or the importance of consensus in university decision-making.

How many top 10 research universities are led by presidents who have no understanding of /experience in the academic system? Ask why that is.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: In my many years in US academe, I am aware of only one person with similar credentials who was truly a successful President. That President also was a lawyer who came from a state legislature to the Office of University President. He and I had a common connection which enabled me to have lunch with him a number of years ago when I visited the campus for a seminar because I was curious about his experiences. He was personable and very candid with me. He told me that while he believed that he brought unique experiences to the position, he was not qualified to speak on academic matters - curriculum, research thrusts, promotion, tenure, etc., and did not succumb to the temptation to do so. Instead, he surrounded himself with trustworthy first-rate academic administrators - Provost, VP Research, Deans, etc. - and delegated responsibility for academic decisions to them, allowing him to focus on the things that he was uniquely qualified to do, including being the public face of the University. The faculty respected him and his tenure as President was widely recognized as a successful one.

If Ms. Parsons is willing to operate on a similar model, she is likely to be successful as President of CSU. However, if she imagines that she is qualified to make academic decisions, she is likely to be at loggerheads with the senior faculty and her presidency will be a failure like the previous one.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: CSU Connections and previous involvement in the community.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate does not have any teaching experience in higher ed or any other capacity. While her Juris Doctorate is an impressive credential, I don't feel like those skills enable her to perform this job any better than someone without it. As a CCA faculty member with a PhD and 12 years of teaching experience in higher ed, I don't have any reason to believe that Dr. Parson's understands ANY of the issues that myself and colleagues are dealing with.

This disconnect with the teaching faculty of this institution is alarming. CCA faculty teach a majority of courses at CSU, especially large lectures (+200) that bankroll the daily operations of this institution, and yet we're paid \$50K a year, which isn't a live wage in Fort Collins. This person is going to make over ten times that amount, and they have no experience with these issues. To me, this suggests that it will be easy for her to look the other way and ignore the pay discrepancies that are taking advantage of our highly-qualified and overworked faculty.

I hope to be proven wrong, but I doubt very seriously that will happen. I am disappointed in this appointment and the search committee for only recommending ONE candidate. What a was of money and time.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The candidate does not have any teaching experience in higher ed or any other capacity. While her Juris Doctorate is an impressive credential, I don't feel like those skills enable her to perform this job any better than someone without it. As a CCA faculty member with a PhD and 12 years of teaching experience in higher ed, I don't have any reason to believe that Dr. Parson's understands ANY of the issues that myself and colleagues are dealing with.

This disconnect with the teaching faculty of this institution is alarming. CCA faculty teach a majority of courses at CSU, especially large lectures (+200) that bankroll the daily operations of this institution, and yet we're paid \$50K a year, which isn't a live wage in Fort Collins. This person is going to make over ten times that amount, and they have no experience with these issues. To me, this suggests that it will be easy for her to look the other way and ignore the pay discrepancies that are taking advantage of our highly-qualified and overworked faculty.

I hope to be proven wrong, but I doubt very seriously that will happen. I am disappointed in this appointment and the search committee for only recommending ONE candidate. What a was of money and time.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: High level of desire to contribute to CSU and broader community

Candidate Weaknesses: HERE IS THE OBVIOUS POINT THAT I EXPECT YOU WILL HERE AGAIN AND AGAIN: Amy Parsons has strong past affiliations with the Chancellor of the CSU system -- they worked together on the CSU campus. And, to any increasing degree, the Chancellor is viewed as micro-managing the CSU campus. The Chancellor was president of CSU for many years and if the new president is highly connected to the Chancellor, then it is likely that (a) the new president will have limited latitude; and (b) the new president will have the same perspectives as the Chancellor. The Chancellor was a successful president of CSU for many years, but the University needs new perspectives (i.e., new leadership) in order to address its gaps and improve. For very good reasons, Amy Parson's is not viewed as providing new leadership.

Amy Parsons also lacks substantial academic experience in terms of knowledge development (e.g., basic research) and dissemination (e.g., teaching), yet these are foundational to any R1 university. This (in and of itself) is not an overriding concern), but becomes highly concerning when considered in tandem with other weaknesses.

Amy Parsons has demonstrated strengths in starting special projects (e.g., SPUR, Todos Santos, Canvas Stadium), yet CSU is desperate need of smart investments in its eight academic colleges, and arguably not more special projects focused largely outside of the core academic mission.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I encourage the Board to reflect on its governance and that of the Chancellor.

If the model it desires is one in which the Chancellor not only operates the CSU systems office but also largely operates CSU (in Fort Collins) by setting directions and priorities/budgets, then it is headed in the right direction. This is a comfortable and controlling approach. However, there are significant downsides that may not be immediately evident. Foremost, CSU will continue in the same direction with the same philosophies underpinning its management. Again, this is comfortable and a means of exerting maximum power, but is it healthy?

Highly complex (and multifaceted) organizations like a large state university need new leaders (with substantial levels of autonomy) to stimulate change, innovation, address weaknesses, and stimulate positive growth.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: '- Has a history with Colorado State University and is from the intermountain west

Candidate Weaknesses: '- Does not have the academic credentials to be considered for a faculty position at Colorado State University

- Has a business acumen as opposed to experience in research, teaching and service which are the actual goals and purposes of Colorado State University
- Is an insider with regards to our current administration. What this means to her independent leadership and any change from the faults in the current administration are then brought into question
- Will continue to ignore the model of shared governance with faculty that is purported to be present at Colorado State University if she follows in the mode of Drs. Frank and Miranda who she has closely worked with
- Leadership is about being able to set examples for people to follow and not just delegate and unfortunately I am unclear how this candidate can lead by example in the areas that Colorado State University needs to focus on which is research, teaching and service

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: In the 30 years that I have been affiliated with Colorado State University this is potentially the most important leadership hire that has been made and we clearly need another direction from where Tony Frank took us and I do not believe a minion of his in the position of President is the best choice. We need to focus on Research, Teaching and Service and the delivery of that with a focus on the state of Colorado. Investing in athletics and recruiting out of state students seems to be the order of the day with a focus on grievance and social justice rather than allowing faculty to do the jobs we were hired to do. We have one of the top Colleges of Veterinary Medicine on the planet but instead of enriching that group we have leadership pursuing a Medical School.... a phenomenally horrible idea and misuse of resources at the University and for the State. We need someone in our top position of leadership that has undergone a faculty search for a position, been a leader in teaching, research and service at a major University, undergone the tenure process, and that we can actually respect for doing the same job we have. And, they need to understand that running a University as a business is not the way forward as our students are not our customers but rather our responsibility.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She is a lawyer - that might be useful, although CSU already employees lawyers. She is very linked to the Chancellor and his vision. I'm not sure if that's a strength though. This reeks of nepotism.

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not speak about faculty in her 6+ page letter. Academics and research are the primary mission of this university and She doesn't have experience with either. She is not an academic. She is not qualified for this position.

From American University: <https://soeonline.american.edu/blog/how-to-become-a-president-of-a-university/>

"For those interested in how to become a university president, it's important to recognize that the main route to achieving that goal is the same as it has been for decades. According to that 2012 ACE study, more than one-third of university presidents had previously held the position of chief academic officer (CAO), working in the higher levels of postsecondary education; more than half of university presidents had "never worked outside of higher education." The most common thread among university presidents' past experience was that 70 percent had served as full-time faculty at some point, a drop of 5 percent since 1986.

The route to becoming a university president usually begins with an advanced degree in the field, like an EdD. After that comes a job in postsecondary education, perhaps as a full-time professor or as a dean overseeing a particular academic unit, such as student affairs. From there, an aspiring university president might spend years as a professor, aiming to become the head of his or her department or perhaps working in another leadership role before applying for the institution's top position as president." **Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:** See weaknesses above, including this useful article from American University on the usual credentials of someone who becomes a university president: <https://soeonline.american.edu/blog/how-to-become-a-president-of-a-university/> Ms Parsons does not have the appropriate academic credentials, knowledge, or experience. Most university professors have an advanced degree in the field, like EdD or PhD. They are usually professors, then deans, provosts, etc, before becoming president. Being a lawyer and heading up a company with a handful of employees is not adequate experience.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Being internal to CSU, not having an academic or research background; the fact that she mentions that she taught in the SAHE program but does not mention that she was asked to not come back to teach in the SAHE program because of how problematic she is due to her inability to deal with her Whiteness, her class positioning, and other dominant positioning. This is even evident in her application letter, naming herself as a Colorado "'Native'". This is incredibly disrespectful to our Indigenous colleagues. CSU is not a corporation nor is it an 'entrepreneurial' endeavor. Both of the projects she mentions, Todos Santos and Spur, are projects that were not wanted by the people who originally lived in these spaces. Todos Santos dispossessed people of their land, and Spur is gentrifying neighborhoods while not offering any real opportunities for upward mobility for the people there. The fact that she takes pride in these projects again shows that she has no social awareness. She does not mention anything about the racial or gender issues we have on campus, nor the equity issues that we as employees are facing. The fact that anyone I've heard talking about this decision has nothing good to say should say a lot.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: How can a person claim to care about shared governance in a process that has been largely done without us? How is it that only upper administration voices get to matter in this decision when they are not the ones impacted on a daily basis? Those of us who are doing the face to face work with students, producing research, doing service for the university apparently don't matter enough to be included in a process that feels rushed. Wouldn't it be better to go about this in a way that actually reflects shared governance? The mass exodus of CSU pro staff and other people should be an indicator to upper level admin that there is something seriously wrong with the ways they are making decisions that impact all of us. It's baffling, truly. I hope the Board of Governors has been paying attention to what's been going on in the California State system, because that is a possible future should they continue to make decisions that we are not included in and that continue to screw us over.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She seems well-prepared for management / admin and has some strong, multi-faceted connections to CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate's weaknesses far outweigh strengths, and I am deeply concerned about this finalist. My concerns include the following, but extend beyond these as well:

--The current finalist does not have a PhD or background in research or instruction in higher education. This means that the finalist does not adequately understand central dynamics of the university, including: what it takes to conduct and manage a research program; grant application processes; mentoring or guiding graduate or undergraduate students; teaching courses and preparing those courses; conducting engaged scholarship; intellectual freedom in an increasingly monitored environment.

--The finalist seems enormously under-qualified, given the above and given her current role as a CEO of an Italian luxury goods e-company.

--The experience the finalist does bring makes me concerned that our public, land grant institution will be run more like a private business, with related expectations, as opposed to the public institution it is.

--The finalist seems to reflect the preferences of current upper administration in the CSU system, as opposed to the preferences of faculty, students, staff, and other members of the CSU community.

--Despite the search committee's role in the process, it seems to have lacked transparency. While faculty were able to submit questions at the beginning, there was no chance to see folks' responses to them, participate in the process afterwards, or select among a few finalists. This is not transparent or procedurally just, but a mockery of those processes.

--I do not see CSU's main strengths in sustainability, energy, and natural resources reflected in this finalist's qualifications.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This is deeply concerning, and I am completely opposed to this finalist. The response across campus, encapsulated at the Faculty Council meeting this month, show that this reflects the collective response of the faculty and many other segments of the CSU community. Please do NOT select Amy Parsons.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Amy has a long history at CSU and so will not take long to get up to speed with our systems, cultural norms, and the like

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy's weaknesses are legion. First, while she has years of experience at CSU as an administrator, she has little or no experience of the most important roles of the university—to teach students and to conduct research. The knowledge necessary to lead a research and teaching institution is not easily come by. Years of disciplined work as a teacher and a scholar are the only roads to understanding these activities. Amy has skipped that journey.

Second, was crucial in making a set of decisions that constitute are greatest challenges today. She managed the systems—HR, OEO, compliance—that most clearly stand in the way of our institutional successes today. Indeed, in meetings regarding improving employee benefits she consistently resisted all changes that would increase faculty and staff compensation via improved retirement and health. How can we expect her to suddenly advocate for the compensation concerns of faculty and staff.

Third, in a moment when the university has a chance to take the next steps into the first ranks of our land grant institutions, Amy represents an old guard. She can only be seen as a henchperson of Tony Frank. For years she was part of the Frank clique. As a former dean said to me, it is understandable that a chancellor wants to surround themselves with known quantities. And yet, the known is what is precisely we need to move away from.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I strongly opposed Amy's appointment as president. There are worse choices: senators and legislators who have even less experience in higher education for example. And yet, Amy's patent lack of qualifications academically and her failed leadership in previous years make her among the worst possible choices to lead the university. Please restart the search.

CSU has such amazing possibilities. So many good people, so many great ideas. Amy's selection feels like a step backwards. Indeed, for the first time in my 20+ years here I will begin to actively look for academic opportunities elsewhere.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has a very good understanding of the administrative structure at CSU and good working relationship with the Chancellor of the CSU system (Dr. Tony Frank). Has demonstrated strong "people skills". Would be strong in development/fund raising.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has never held a faculty position and, therefore, has never had experience in teaching, research and/or extension, the primary missions of a land grant university such as CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I personally consider the lack of experience in teaching and research to be major deficits of the final candidate. That being said, upon reviewing the consensus "priorities" that were the focus issues communicated by the CSU faculty to the search committee through the open fora ("...campus employees wanted a new president who is committed to solving workload, retention, and morale issues, who is committed to diversity, equity and inclusion and who is focused on students. They also wanted someone who is a collaborator and strategic thinker. Participants ranked low salaries, particularly among classified and faculty who are not on a tenure track, as the top challenge for a new president, followed by the high cost of attending CSU."), it is not surprising that a candidate with the resume and skill sets of Amy Parsons would rise to the top. "Quality Education" ranked in the lower half of the "Challenges" at CSU and Research did not show up at all (according to the "Listening feedback results" document: https://presidentalsearch.colostate.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/45/2022/10/Listening-Session-Overview_Oct-2022.pdf). So, to now say that these deficits in the resume are disqualifying I find to be a bit disingenuous of the faculty and Faculty Council, since these qualifications were NEVER articulated by the majority of the faculty as important qualifications for the job (from what I could find). In short, it seemed that the majority members of the faculty focused on "soft skill" qualifications, but had forgotten about the "essential skills" requirements for the functioning and leadership in an academic institution.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: He has strengths that don't necessarily qualify her to be the president of a land grant, R-1 institution.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has no academic background that would readily allow her to recognize how academic units operate, how faculty and staff operate and how to reach out to the student body. She was the right hand of the administration while she was employed at CSU where she got into her role without a search, and this significantly questions the validity of this nomination, is she really qualified, or is she a good friend. She is heavily involved with current and past higher administration, which would limit her ability to bring in fresh and diverse input and direction into how CSU operates.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The way President McConnell was removed from her position was very unsettling. There was no input sought from faculty and staff, and no proper explanation was made by the Chancellor or BoG. At that point (in summer) several colleagues speculated that Amy Parsons would be the next president as the Chancellor prefers working with people who will do what he says. I was shocked to see the outcome of a "fair" search was what they speculated. The announcement made last Friday had statements from the search committee members that looked like they were forced to repeat after each other how "fair" the search was. I cannot remember such an announcement that tries to "prove" that a search was fair. I have significant concerns on how one man controls the whole operations of CSU, without real input from its constituents. There has been no transparency throughout this whole process, instead cover up efforts on a "fair" search. I really hope the BoG reconsiders who they have nominated. And beyond this, re-evaluates how CSU system is being operated and controlled. And finally, all colleagues I have talked to reported feeling the same way I am feeling: being very uncomfortable raising our concerns related to what has been going on, due to worries about retaliation. What does this say about how things currently are in OUR university?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I guess her biggest strength is that she is pre-sanctioned by CSU's BOG and Dr. Frank. She will not be kicked out for trying to change the toxic culture that they have instilled and maintained for years. At least we will not make national news by rescinding the contract to a President mid-term.

Another possible strength is that she is basically a "local".

She is entrenched and thriving in the culture already (Vice Chancellor).

Candidate Weaknesses: That she will not aim to be a disruptor of the toxic culture in place. No wonder why we have difficulties trying to retain diverse faculty and make CSU a more livable to community for non-whites, non-heterosexuals, etc., etc.

She has limited or non-existing experience with research or teaching. How could a candidate lacking those important skills end up becoming the sole finalist unless the scales were tipped from the beginning in her favor? Evidently this search was a total charade. Good job there!

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It defies credulity to propose that out of a national search (of 60+ applicants) we ended up with an internal candidate for University President that has no teaching or research experience at all!

It's clear that it was a waste of money this "national" search given how we end up with a candidate so unqualified. Why even bother with a process? Just appoint Frank's candidate (as you did), and don't make our community waste time and resources. If this is the best the "market" can find we should reduce the salary we pay to Presidents for the evident lack of preparation of candidates in the marketplace.

Do you really expect CSU community to believe that none of the other semifinalists had the credentials? If that is the case, then you should reassess hiring the company you used to "attract talent" and review the scales that you came up with to provide this ridiculous outcome.

CSU's BOG and Chancellor never lose a chance to disappoint our campus community! Kudos on consistency when it comes to that, at least.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU and administrative roles

Candidate Weaknesses: May not advocate for diversity and equity of the individuals that work at CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The lack of transparency around President McConnell's departure has led to the CSU community filling in their own details. The impression that many have is that she did not play by the good ol' boys rules and lost her job because of it. It seemed like Joyce McConnell was invested in equity at CSU and willing to go against leadership if it was to serve the greater good for CSU and in doing so upset the Board of Governors. She was the only CSU President over the past 20 years to create meaningful change that addressed the inequity at CSU. It felt like she was a President for the People. Although Amy Parsons has an amazing CV and is qualified for the role I feel she was selected because she aligns with the opinions of the Chancellor. I do not see evidence that she will work for CSU but rather will work to keep the Board at ease. Amy Parsons will the unfortunate task of trying to convince the CSU community that she will not just be a puppet. The impression I have is that her efforts will align with the Chancellor and she will be the "yes man" the Board is looking for, but the consequence will be a stagnant University that will struggle to retain the talented individuals who make CSU great. Leaders who need everyone to agree with them leads to everyone on the team looking in the same direction, the effects of this can be catastrophic when a challenge arises from an unexpected direction. This is a disappointing time in CSU's history and I don't know that there is much that can be done because clearly the ship has sailed. As we move forward it is important to note that we don't want to live in the past anymore. There should be zero tolerance for good ol' boys club politics and hopefully Amy Parsons will see that and create a resilient team to offset the demands of being hired to be a yes man.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Organizational Leadership

Knowledge of the CSU System

Candidate Weaknesses: Non-academic higher education experience

Failed international outreach

Lack of experience with a land-grant institution and it's mission

Strategic vision(s) without results

Embedded in the corporate model which has proven ineffective in higher education as an operational paradigm

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am concerned about Ms. Parsons' lack of academic experience coupled with her corporate ethos. We have seen universities all over this country grapple with decreasing local funding, fewer students, and Boards that want returns on investment turn toward presidents with corporate backgrounds for success only to have it backfire. Universities are not corporations. They are a public good and service regardless of funding models. This is particularly true of land-grant institutions. While I appreciate Ms. Parsons' extensive experience with the CSU system, that experience was running the business side of the system, not academic, which can pose problems with priorities, decision making, and strategic vision. I also worry about the cronyism apparent in this pick including the veiled search process and Board being on the search committee. I fear we are overly concerned with an international focus for our president and university, which is passé for American universities. University's with an international scope are already embedded in those markets. We need to be moving into the future of education by finding CSU's strengths and niches with the public then focusing on those for branding, recruitment, and funding, not playing "keeping up with the Jones". Lastly, Ms. McConnell was ousted in a conspicuous if not ugly way and is now being replaced with an insider which does not present well. We need a president who will double down on the teaching and research mission of this university and ensure that work is supported in all ways not kowtow to the Chancellor or Board of Governors.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: familiarity with CSU

familiarity with Colorado

led multiple initiatives at CSU (Canvas Stadium, Todos Santos, Spur, etc.)

executive experience

as CEO of an international company, arguably some business experience that could be valuable

led CSU during the 2008-2010 recession

Likely to generate new sources of revenue and engage new donors

Candidate Weaknesses: no demonstrated familiarity with faculty or the role of faculty on campus

no demonstrated familiarity or indication of detailed interactions with students (graduate and/or undergraduate)

commitment to shared governance is unclear. Knows what it means, but how is it actionable in her administration?

though the familiarity with CSU is a strength, it is also a weakness as this candidate has no higher ed experience outside of CSU and has only worked for one leadership team while at CSU (President/Chancellor Tony Frank). Similarly, the cumulative professional experience outside of CSU is less than 10 years.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Resoundingly, the largest concern with this candidate is the method in which they were identified as a sole finalist. Arguably, in a national search which yielded more than 50 candidates and more than 15 semi-finalists, there are other candidates that bring forth a more diverse work experience, familiarity with the role of faculty, and more demonstrated engagement and commitment to students than this candidate.

Certainly this candidate brings a business acumen and a record of launching successful initiatives at CSU, but the candidate's lack of experience outside of CSU and a work record that has only one higher ed supervisor (Tony Frank) is troubling and has indications of nepotism. In order for any candidate to be successful, a transparent hiring process is essential. In this case, the lack of transparency and then the revealing of a sole finalist with direct ties to the current administration is concerning. This must be addressed.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Amy Parsons is not fit to be president of CSU. She has no experience as a faculty member, did not mention faculty in her paperwork for hire, and is someone cherry-picked for the position. I see her candidacy without any strengths.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy is not fit to be president of CSU and has many weaknesses:

1. She is a businesswoman and does not understand or have experience as a faculty member.
2. She does not know how research works since she is not a faculty member.
3. She is a businesswoman without knowledge of academia.
4. Her degrees do not support her knowledge base for a position as president.
5. She is part of the Tony-Rick-Amy show and we do not need the same ole' same ole' way of doing things. I feel she is a pawn for them.
6. Her knowledge base is very limited as a white, cis, woman of privilege and she does not acknowledge or care about diversity, equity, or inclusion. She has no track record.
7. Her business record in leading a make-up company has no bearing on how to run a university.
8. She is another white woman with a law degree but this does not make her fit to be CSU's president.
9. I don't think she will support faculty and staff.
10. She is very removed from knowing how to work with students.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The Board of Governors does not seem very concerned about diversity, equity, and inclusion. It seems as if they want the same leadership they had with Tony Frank, which is no longer relevant for CSU.

As a board, it is disappointing that you are not doing all you can to work toward hiring someone who can guide our university to become a Hispanic Serving university. If we want to serve students from Colorado, we must understand the growing population of BIPOC students, especially the largest population of Hispanics. Please be more forward-thinking and show you care about diversity, equity, and inclusion to meet the growing population of BIPOC students.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has familiarity with CSU through her previous association, primarily with university operations, is a benefit.

Candidate Weaknesses: CSU is an R1 research intensive academic institution, and Amy Parsons does not have any experience in either research or education. The university needs to have a leader who knows what the lived experience of the community actually is so they can effect change that is desperately needed, and from what I know Amy Parsons does not. The concept that Amy Parsons will come in and "hit the ground running" is not really true, as there are many aspects of the university enterprise that she may know of but not truly understand. Our former presidents were academics and knew how academia functions, but I don't know that Amy Parson does.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Even more than Amy Parsons not being an ideal candidate for this position, the almost complete lack of community input on this important position has been lacking. I was shocked to hear earlier this week how the finalist for the position had already been chosen, without having to go through any sort of on-campus interview process or having ANY interaction with the campus community at large. With faculty, department chairs, and deans there is always the opportunity for the candidate to share their vision with the community and for the opportunity to say whether or not they feel the candidate will be a leader they can trust. There was none of that with this search, and it feels like this convenient candidate is being forced on us by the Board of Governors and search committee. If this nomination is approved, there will be little trust in Amy Parson's administration. CSU has long prided itself on the concept of shared governance, but this nontransparent and deeply flawed process for an extremely important position feels like a middle-finger from the BoG to the CSU community at large.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The candidate has a solid record of accomplishments during her time at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate touts her experiences at CSU, but in each case, these are peripheral to the primary educational mission of CSU Main Campus. The stadium-Canvas negotiation is wonderful, but the stadium is a boondoggle expense that, as with nearly all Division I athletics programs, is a money loser, even setting aside the terrible football records and golden parachutes for terrible coaches. Second, the Spur campus just takes away resources better spent in Fort Collins. It is a shiny turd. No faculty will want to commute to Denver to teach courses there. There is no revenue model to entice academic programs to contribute to it. It is only a "win" for CSU system, but Ms. Parsons is a finalist for the Fort Collins campus, not the system.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Ms. Parsons appears to be a reasonably strong candidate, but for a position at CSU system rather than CSU Fort Collins. Her letter and accomplishments speak to experience with programs that are peripheral to our main mission. I'd like to see a candidate that speaks to the problems we really face, such as poorly staffed support programs such as HR, OEO, OSP, Facilities, etc., that provide terrible campus service as a consequence. What about the fact that faculty salaries lag far behind the median R1 university in the recent CUPA data? How about prioritizing CSU Fort Collins infrastructure, rather than talking cost containment on buildings like Clark that produce over 50% of the student credit hours at CSU (and are therefore directly tied to our number one revenue resource - tuition)? How are we going to make tough choices when revenue is flat to reduce support to some programs that are in decline to support those struggling with unsupported growth? Those are the answers I want to hear from a finalist.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The candidate has been deeply involved in large-scale building projects: the stadium, CSU Spur, etc. I could imagine them doing well with fundraising and with public appearances on behalf of the university. (But should these projects really have been prioritized? Will this be her emphasis as president? Is she working on them just because simply they are big? How well do they really fit into the overall teaching and research mission of the university? Do we really need a president who views this as the best use of her time?)

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate simply doesn't have the level of experience expected of a university president: She hasn't come up through the ranks as an Associate Dean, Dean, and Provost. She has never been a faculty member. It's not clear that she has a vision for the institution when it comes to research or to teaching and learning.

There is a widespread perception on campus that she has been chosen because of her close association with our past president and current chancellor, who has been trying to shift the focus away from a flagship model (Fort Collins) and towards a system-wide model (Spur, etc.). Fine, but we need an independent voice who will advocate for and defend the Fort Collins campus in those discussions.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This choice is so illuminating about what the Board of Governors thinks a university president should be: which is basically a real estate developer who will appear at public events on behalf of the university in a cowboy hat.

This is not a candidate who is deeply immersed in the university's core mission of teaching and research. She lacks a deep knowledge of pedagogy or of the primary operations of the university. And in that respect, this choice demonstrates the Board's fundamental lack of understanding and regard for that core educational mission.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: '- Deep knowledge and experience with governance, administration and operations of CSU from high level.

- Deep knowledge and experience about operations and politics of CSU System.
- Well-connected, versed in external affairs of university.

Candidate Weaknesses: '- Not a traditional academic background - teaching, research, service, outreach.

- No experience in other academic institutions -- lacks diversity of high-level academic institutional leadership, only one lens of academic administration at CSU.
- Unclear evidence of demonstrated changes to an institution RE: diversity, equity, inclusion, access
- Too tied to recent leadership history and legacy of CSU -- can't see the candidate bringing fresh perspectives, feels like status quo.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This feels like a conservative, status quo choice of candidates that is unlikely to bring fresh insights and approaches to steering CSU, more incremental, nibbling-at-the-edges but mostly a custodian of status quo. The candidate has no other demonstrated evidence of a diversity of high-level leadership at other academic institutions from which to draw inspiration, mentoring and models -- it's been all CSU the whole time. This would send a clear public and historic message that the university's powers-that-be really do not value diversity in actuality, despite being plastered all over our marketing materials. Inbreeding of any population leads to unforeseen consequences, many negative. Not just optics (which are already bad), but in reality. I am utterly ambivalent about the candidate- neither really excited nor totally repelled. I would love to be excited, but have been at CSU long enough to know it won't happen. At least I'm not totally repelled. Regardless, if chosen, I will give the candidate a chance to prove me wrong.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I find it outrageous that the Board has seen fit to consider only one finalist for this position, particularly when that finalist is a white candidate for a leadership position at a university that has had very public struggles in recent years with its commitment to diversity. President McConnell's brief tenure was marked by a number of diversity-related controversies. Segueing from that into a search in which a white President is named with no opportunity for the community to consider other candidates seems like a lost opportunity to address these concerns, and not very wise in terms of the university's public reputation.

In the announcement, there was great emphasis placed on how the search committee prioritized diversity. Oh, really? Well then show us. If Amy Parsons is truly the best candidate, that will become clear as the community considers a number of strong finalists. And if the other finalists were really SO weak that they don't even merit full consideration by the community, then I would suggest that the Search Committee did a very poor job of recruiting strong candidates.

Were there no candidates of color who could plausibly vie for this position? That seems quite hard to believe.

I think that hiring Amy Parsons in this manner will invite controversy and dissatisfaction. She will start her tenure under great suspicion from a significant portion of the community who can't understand why the hiring process happened the way it did and why a search that supposedly prioritized diversity could not produce even a single viable finalist who is not white. And given CSU's unwelcome media attention in recent years, I can't understand why the Board would risk what seems to me the inevitable fallout from such a process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience at CSU previous to this position and knowledge of the context and players. She seems to have the tenacity and connections required for success in a position like this. When I interviewed here for a tenure line position, I was excited about seeing female leadership at this level and it was a definitely helped tip me toward coming to CSU (among many other factors). I hope that the person in charge can

Candidate Weaknesses: I am worried about her lack of academic experience, to be sure. I have worked on R1 campuses in the past that had business community leadership who took an overly economical/business perspective to campus operations. This resulted in many tensions with academic faculty and (imo) less positive outcomes for addressing social and environmental challenges related to campus operations (because money was always the top/only concern). I don't feel like I have enough information about the candidate to ensure that she is a holistic thinker.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please ensure that the candidate has a holistic perspective beyond running campus like a business. We do not have access to the interview process and are trusting your judgement. It is also frustrating that the campus community does not know why the last president left, and we are not able to assess whether/not the new candidate will be more successful.

I left my last tenure line job largely because of contentious campus leadership and the way that their sweeping and opaque decisions constantly and negatively affected the life of faculty and staff. Campus leadership matters. I hope we can avoid this fate at CSU!

https://www.columbiamissourian.com/news/higher_education/survey-shows-mu-faculty-not-satisfied-with-chancellors-work/article_dd253d0a-2a47-11ed-8def-3fe6e3af207d.html

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: other than familiarity and experience with CSU, i have no idea.

Candidate Weaknesses: no research background,
no teaching background.
no outreach background.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: it's interesting that most positions at CSU invite people to meet the finalists, whether a department or administrative unit.

For example, today's invitation to meet the TILT candidates reads:

""Dear Colleagues,

We would like to invite you to the Open Forums for the search for TILT's Executive Director position.

The open forums will be hosted both in person as well as on Teams. The Open Forums will be recorded.

Candidate 1) Rob Flaherty here to join meeting	Monday, Dec. 12th	10:00-11:00 a.m., LSC 306 or click here to join meeting
Candidate 2) Kem Saichaie here to join meeting	Weds. Dec. 14th	10:00-11:00 a.m., LSC 306 or click here to join meeting
Candidate 3) Laura Carruth here to join meeting	Friday Dec. 16th	10:00-11:00 a.m., LSC 300 or click here to join meeting
Candidate 4) Sue Doe here to join meeting	Monday Dec. 19th	10:00-11:00 a.m., LSC 306 or click here to join meeting

Access to candidate's CV will be available one day prior to their scheduled Open Forum—
_Folder icon Redacted CV's TILT Executive Director Search.

Please share your feedback here at the conclusion of the Open Forum."

Yet for the highest profile job, we leave it to these folks: <https://csusystem.edu/board-of-governors/>

Dr. Easley seems to be the only one with any experience in higher education. The rest are certainly accomplished; they just have no experience in the academic world. I know there is a search committee that does have CSU faculty and student representation, but it is dwarfed by those who are not experienced academics...but i guess that doesn't matter, does it?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Insider with connections to old school CSU networks (a strength to those networks, not to anyone else).

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching or research experience. Out of touch with needs and current realities of higher education, including here on campus at CSU.

Also, her legacy as someone who led the charge for the stadium reflects a project that was widely opposed by faculty, students, and the Fort Collins community. She also helped lead Todos Santos campus, which had many initial negative impacts on the local community, including the displacement of local fisherfolk from a beach long used for local subsistence. As she said in an interview these were things that she "forced it into the world."

She also said in 2021 in the same interview, referring to her leaving CSU, "It was a bigger risk to stay than to leave." Is this really the kind of leader we want at CSU, someone who puts their own careerism ahead, and someone who is an opportunist?

<https://soundcloud.com/user-254295385/when-playing-it-safe-becomes-riskier-than-change-w-amy-parsons>

When Amy Parsons left CSU

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy Parsons is an unacceptable candidate. The process did not allow for adequate faculty input. Moreover, the secretiveness of the process sows distrust. Just because other universities have opted, with major problems, to hire non-academics to run their universities, it does not mean that CSU should do so. The Board of Governors is putting the reputation of CSU at risk with this decision. The university will be perceived as an institution that puts its business values ahead of its academic values. Truly shameful decision. To think that there was not another better finalist is hard to believe, especially because there is no transparency.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Candidate strengths are those highlighted in publicity, namely familiarity with and commitment to CSU, including experience with university operations and key initiatives.

Candidate Weaknesses: As noted, the candidate does not have experience related to academics and research. This is a major concern, not only because teaching and research are central to the CSU's mission, but also because some of the most significant challenges at CSU are related to faculty retention, student enrollment and retention (including demographic "cliff" impacts and DEIJ), the lack of a responsive funding to support growing programs (or pathways to redistribute base funding to support enrollment shifts related to colleges/majors.)

Weakness could potentially be overcome if she created a close advisory and leadership team, with complementary expertise. (For example, someone like Sue James would be terrific.) On the current presidents' office and strategy teams, most members have similar backgrounds to Parson's including lack of academic and research experience.

An additional concern is that Parson's daughter is a freshman at CSU. Although this has been described as a strength, it could also present a conflict of interest. There is potential that her daughter's experience and perspective might hold influence over presidential priorities and decisions.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It would be helpful to have a clear strategy and plan in place should Parson's be hired as the next CSU President to address areas where she lacks experience and ensure that she will be successful and well-supported in her role. It would be incredibly damaging to the university if the second successive female president is also not perceived as a successful leader.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: CSU historical involvement

Candidate Weaknesses: This candidate has not obtained a research-based degree - a terminal PhD is essential if leading a university. In addition, this person has no experience with the unending tasks of obtaining tenure. How can she lead without that first hand knowledge of this seminal experience? Of all the highly educated (to PhD and postdoc levels), tenured, experienced, published women in the academy - why would this candidate be selected? It is embarrassing and lacks explicit understanding of the point of higher education. A JD is not a research-based degree and not 'surviving' tenure gives this candidate very little concept of who she is supposed to lead. Not to mention - surviving on your faculty's salary - that is a task that is worth noting. Choose an educated and research-based female leader.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This candidate has not obtained a research-based degree - a terminal PhD is essential if leading a university. In addition, this person has no experience with the unending tasks of obtaining tenure. How can she lead without that first hand knowledge of this seminal experience? Of all the highly educated (to PhD and postdoc levels), tenured, experienced, published women in the academy - why would this candidate be selected? It is embarrassing and lacks explicit understanding of the point of higher education. A JD is not a research-based degree and not 'surviving' tenure gives this candidate very little concept of who she is supposed to lead. Not to mention - surviving on your faculty's salary - that is a task that is worth noting. Choose an educated and research-based female leader.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has articulated a strong sense of connection to CSU. She has previous experience in administration at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: I realize that this is a traditional view and probably not surprising, coming from a faculty member. But the candidate's lack of any experience as a faculty member -- in any disciplinary or interdisciplinary field, at any institution, at any rank or appointment type, and for any length of time -- gives me pause. CSU is supposed to function through a system of "shared governance" between faculty and administrators. Selecting a president who has experience in only one half of the "shared" part of university governance is not desirable, especially at this time.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Perhaps more importantly than the candidate, it is the search process and its current outcome that I find profoundly disturbing. First, the search committee seemed to have far more representation from administrators, alumni, and BOG members than faculty. Second, the emphasis on "listening sessions" to learn what CSU faculty and others wanted in the next president is **not** the same thing as having multiple finalists to consider for the position. Third, the fact that despite its claims of a rigorous, vigorous, inclusive search process, the search committee could identify only one finalist is suspicious. To me, this looks more like a direct hire than the result of an open, competitive national search. At a minimum, the search committee, FC, and the BOG owe the rest of us a number: the number of applications received and reviewed, out of which only this one candidate was deemed qualified for the position.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I like that Parsons is a CSU CLA graduate. In a STEM world, it would be nice having a liberal arts voice in the president's office. I also like that Parsons has experience with facilities and maintenance. The state of facilities at CSU is embarrassingly abysmal and a frustrating impediment to effective teaching and research. I would expect her to take on the significant maintenance backlog.

Candidate Weaknesses: Parsons's lack of educational experience and a terminal degree is very troubling. Institutionally, CSU seems stagnant, without vision, and in need of a leader from outside the university. Parsons is not that outsider and appears to be close to the chancellor, who has embarked on very expensive capital improvement projects that I struggle to connect to the university's core mission and have not clearly shown return on investment. I am concerned the SPUR campus is a similar such capital investment: a costly facility looking for a purpose.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: As CCA faculty, Parsons's nomination is particularly galling because administration is adamantly unwilling to consider conversion of CCA to tenure-track lines despite meeting qualifications, possessing terminal degrees, exhibiting commitment to the university, and serving in functions integral to CSU's mission (most notably teaching). I cannot convert to a tenure-track line because my position was never subject to a nationwide search and job talk. Yet Parsons has somehow leapfrogged all of this to become to only nominee for president in a very opaque process. That's a very inconsistent and concerning message.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: (1) Prior experience at the executive level at CSU.

(2) Commitment to CSU and its success.

(3) Having an entrepreneurial quality.

Candidate Weaknesses: (1) No experience with the main responsibilities of an academic institution like SCU, which is research, teaching, and service.

(2) No experience in managing an academic unit, like a department or a college and dealing with day-to-day challenges of faculty, staff, and students.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: (1) The hiring process was not transparent enough and was rather rushed. I feel that the transparency standards that we must follow for hiring faculty are at a much higher level than what was practiced in this hiring process.

(2) Having only one finalist who has considerable conflict of interest with the CSU system executives who are assessing her is very concerning. Why aren't we having multiple finalists and letting CSU faculty, staff, and students comment on the quality of each finalist?

(3) The process and circumstances under which the previous president was terminated was not transparent either. This continuous lack of transparency at the highest level of CSU is a major cause for concern and suspicion. This will create legitimacy problem for the new president and will make her job extremely challenging. It is as if she has already failed before even starting her work, which is not fair to her. I recommend avoiding rushed appointment and instead having more finalists for the position. Make the process more transparent and engage the faculty, staff, and students in it. This will help the new president tremendously.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: A personal, long-term commitment to CSU. She clearly is committed to the university and has extensive experience, both personal and professional, with the campus and the system.

She also appears to have extensive administrative experience already, along with a law background.

Candidate Weaknesses: No PhD (no grad school beyond law school), no real experience as faculty, and no experience as a researcher. This is a huge issue, in my opinion. Administrators who do not understand what it means to undertake years of research or who do not possess real long-term classroom experience, particularly with undergrads, simply cannot truly understand the concerns and experiences of those of us in the trenches.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: People coming from the business world pretty consistently have the bottom line as their lodestar and it is a major disservice to the university community. Education is not a business and students are not customers, passive receivers of a product. Our last leader out of the business world was not so great.

I worry about the clear agricultural/tech leanings. Will the main emphasis be on sports and on science/ag research dollars? Will she also focus on preparing our learners to be good civic participants and educated persons with critical thinking skills, ready to tackle the huge issues of the 21st-century landscape, or will the focus only be on job preparation? Where do the liberal arts and general education -- which should be the true heart of any university -- fit into Ms. Parson's vision of the university?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She knows the CSU system based on her previous time at the University, thus her learning curve will be smaller than an external hire.

Candidate Weaknesses: 1. Knowing the CSU system (strength previously stated) does not mean she is the right candidate to serve as our next president.

2. It is not clear based on the public materials shared what she brings to CSU that will move us forward.

3. She has not had any other university leadership experience, outside of CSU, that she can use as a foundation for how other universities might handle issues.

4. She might know how to be a lawyer and how to run a luxury business, but it is not clear if she knows how to lead a land-grant university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I have heard people at CSU state that we should 'grow our own' and yet I believe we need a mix of promoting our own faculty/staff and hiring exceptional external faculty/staff to move our university forward. It honestly feels like this candidate is someone that the Chancellor wanted in this role and thus he selected (no matter that 31 people were on the search committee and reminded us about that in public press materials). Given the Chancellor is a CSU grown member of the leadership team, perhaps it is better to have the president be an external hire. Finally, I am grateful that faculty council passed a resolution to ask faculty/staff their thoughts, and my question is, ""Does it really matter what we think?"" Leadership is going to do whatever they want, and the BoG tends to follow what Tony says.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with the local Fort Collins community

Candidate Weaknesses: (1) No experience working with students and faculty as it relates to the academic component of the university

(2) This is an insider hire--a President of a prestigious university should focus on bringing in new perspective as opposed to the legacy perspective of old leadership

(3) Ms. Parsons has no experience working with the higher education landscape as an educator--this should be a necessary qualification for a position focused on education

(4) Other universities that have hired CEOs in this position have lost talented faculty as this move does not show Board of Governor support for advancing teaching and researching--the things that are at the core of CSU

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I attended listening sessions in the fall and never heard anyone--faculty, students, or staff--express a desire to hire someone with so few qualifications to lead our university. I heard staff and faculty ask for a new President committed to (1) diversity, equity and inclusion; (2) providing support for staff and faculty to support students through effective teaching and advising; (3) advancing research initiatives on a global scale; and (4) contending with serious pay issues. Ms. Parsons isn't prepared for such a job given her qualifications.

I am disappointed that the university wasn't presented with clearer opportunity to provide feedback on finalists. This shows a serious lack of transparency--something antithetical to the institution's mission.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The faculty were not presented with strengths of the candidate. The announcement of a single finalist without a thorough discussion (just one email and a source article to make a judgement) it is hard to say I know their strengths.

Candidate Weaknesses: I see the candidate is a CEO. This does not look good for a university. We are not a company that needs to be managed. We need a strong academic with a strong vision for a research/teaching institution, we do not need someone who balances budgets.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: According to the board ""As a Board, we were impressed by her private business background and also looked at her leadership success in building the Spur campus, in fundraising, in designing our Todos Santos Center in Mexico, in creating the Commitment to Campus program for employees on campus, in launching a whole set of strategic partnerships and plans, and in connecting with diverse people and industries across Colorado. All of this pushed her to the top of a very talented pool"

Private business background will not help a university president.

Todos Santos is a disaster and should not be regarded as a resume item for our president. We will see about the spur.

The commitment to campus is good (I do like that) but it is hard to imagine in the list of accomplishments, this is the best thing to say about the candidate? I guess it is hard to imagine that this is the best the university could find in the search but likely disappointing.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

- Candidate Weaknesses:**
1. Lack of academic and research background
 2. Focus and expertise seems to strongly emphasize corporate aspects more appropriate for a for-profit corporation rather than a public (land-grant!) research and teaching university.
 3. Does not seem to prioritize faculty, graduate students, or other campus workers and the issues we have raised, including compensation or instructional needs/support.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am deeply concerned that both Amy Parsons herself and university administration have frequently used her experience within CSU as a primary strength of Parsons for the position, because this experience has primarily arisen via nominated appointments rather than open applications, which does not signal widespread support from the CSU community. Further, the CSU projects she was involved in during these appointments did not have strong community support nor particularly successful results (e.g., stadium, INTO program), causing me to still be unsure of the specific strengths proponents of Parsons for this position are trying to highlight.

Of greatest concern, few of Parsons communication about her interest or qualifications for the position indicate a strong desire to prioritize the people of CSU, and paired with her lack of experience in either teaching or research, this suggests that the students and employees of the university will be negatively impacted by this appointment.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business operations and outreach; making money for others.

Candidate Weaknesses: Building culture. Brief and fleeting acknowledgment of the 2000 faculty; 33,000+ students; and the 4,400 administrative staff. There appears to be no convincing evidence that this candidate puts staff, co-workers, or peers first. For example, the lack of humility with one line ("when I make mistakes, I own them") is drowned in other 4,000 words of accomplishments.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We have experienced a global pandemic, a surprise firing of the University President, wicked inflation, and surveys that indicate graduate students, faculty, administrative staff, and state classified employees are all struggling. While the nominee repeatedly states her intimate understanding of CSU and operations, here is no indication that this nominee is aware that we need to take care of the problems in our "house" first.

Her dismissive line that "when everyone was at home", she was the lone brave person to venture into the world of Italian luxury. Many lost jobs and businesses; many lost loved ones during the pandemic. Her experience was a rarity and the lack of self-awareness is troubling when reflecting on the University's mission of welcoming, valuing, and affirming all members of the CSU community.

Sustainability is more than LEED certification and brokered deals with Coke; it is about your students, staff, researchers, and instructors.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows mainly the administrative side of the university

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of familiarity with the academic efforts of the university

The credentials of the candidate are not impressive and not of the stature of a president of a R1 University.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The search process conducted by the university is flawed. Finalists need to be brought to campus. The secrecy that surrounded is concerning. The fact that the search committee contained members of the Board of Governors, the entity who will be making the decision, is not a practice at CSU in the selection of candidates for any rank. The hiring authority is not involved in the selection process.

Now that a single candidate has been identified, this candidate needs to be vetted by the university community.

Does the board understand the role and mission of a university? They will select a candidate who has never been through the academic rank. Is the board thinking of the university as a business? It is concerning that CSU will move into a business operation where degrees will be conferred because students pay tuition. It is concerning standards will be lowered. It is concerning that this President will select a Provost and other high up administrative personnel that will lack understanding of the education mission of the university. I am confident that Faculty Council Leadership will strongly uphold educational values.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Professionally, she is a successful businesswoman that will ensure that the university is maximizing revenues while cutting unnecessary spending. I believe that she will prioritize athletics, which is a way to tie alumni and donor support alike. Even further, the fact that she can thrive as a woman in business proves that she can encourage high levels of donor support. Personally, she is a mother (of a CSU student). I cannot think of a better fit than a student's mother to know how to improve the University. Finally, I think she will prioritize items that are in the students' best interests.

Candidate Weaknesses: None.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU is a business, and we need a strong businesswoman to run the university, end of story. However, this does not mean bending to every parent's whim, but truly standing up for what is in the best interest of the students. I have no concerns whatsoever that she does not have a PhD, and perhaps even consider that to be one of her greatest strengths. Furthermore, Universities cannot succeed without strong athletics programs. Anecdotal evidence, but I've talked to several season ticket holders that are not renewing as a result of the football team's lackluster performance in recent years, lack of alumni involvement, lack of support for former team members. If we want to remain a viable University in the near (and distant) future, Amy absolutely needs to be our President.

want to remain a viable University in the near (and distant) future, Amy absolutely needs to be our President.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU and Colorado issues.

Successful in her time here in the roles she was asked to fill.

Seems to manage outward-facing advocacy and development dimensions of the role well.

Candidate Weaknesses: No Ph.D.

No research experience.

No faculty experience.

No direct faculty leadership (Presidential cabinet does not cover this as it serves the President, not the faculty).

No mention of land grant mission, extension, outreach, research, experiment station in her rather extensive relationship management oriented letter.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Academic credentials and experience should be top shelf. No terminal degree and no experience with research and management of a faculty position at a research-oriented land grant institution are huge red flags and should be disqualifying as a finalist.

We have had two bad experiences with presidents with similar lack of familiarity with the research role of the university (Penley and McConnell). Both loaded up the president's office with administrators, lawyers and business types, rather than concern themselves with the mission of the university. Significant concern that she will not act as an independent and visionary advocate for CSU in Fort Collins, but rather reprise her role in support of Tony Frank's vision of the institution. New ideas and separation between the offices is more likely to serve us than familiarity and collegiality from former roles.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: No obvious strengths that would make her 'the best choice' among a group of candidates.

The idea that because she is from CSU this makes her a good choice goes against most hiring principles that suggest the strongest 'teams' have diverse perspectives and are from diverse backgrounds. We are not supposed to be hiring ourselves. Hires from outside the institution must be given the training to succeed. The argument that because she understands CSU (because she was a student here, worked as an administrator and lawyer) means she will be the best choice for the top leadership position is insulting.

Candidate Weaknesses: Never faculty, not a scholar, never in the classroom, has no vision except keeping the status quo, too closely aligned to Chancellor. Her admin experience is not broad enough to give her any special insight into how to run a complex institution of higher ed.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This choice feels insulting, particularly to faculty and students. It is the first time since I was hired here that I strongly felt that the institution has gone astray. It makes me want to look for another position.

Parsons has none of the experience necessary (nor academic/scholarly training) to navigate CSU as we seek the status of an Hispanic serving institution, or to support faculty and students in meaningful ways. It is hard to imagine that there were not better suited candidates.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Previous experience at CSU (although see below). I would imagine they get along well with Tony Frank and the Board of Governors

Candidate Weaknesses: Apparently this candidate has no experience in either education or research. These should be the primary mission of the University. Experience seems to be mostly related to managing dubious projects like the Stadium and the Spur, these are the opposite of the focus that I would like to see in a President. I have a hard time imagining that this candidate will focus on what I see as priorities (education and research).

If this person is being brought on as a lawyer/businessperson, I'd expect them to gravitate towards those areas. CSU could probably use better financial management, but I also don't really see clear experience in those areas for this candidate (based on the little info we have). The stadium project will be a money-losing effort and their limited experience running a small company seems irrelevant to running an enterprise the scope of a large research university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: There was not even an attempt to make the case for this candidate as the best choice. Seems extremely tone-deaf given the expensive firing of the former President, which was done all in the dark with the clear possibility of conflict of interest. This should have been much more transparent with community feedback on multiple candidates.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has worked for the University before.

She obviously has the backing of Tony Frank.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has worked for the University before. No new blood = no real change = a dying institution.

She obviously has the backing of Tony Frank. Another opportunity for the boys club to influence in a very direct way how our University operates.

Additionally, she has never taught (the purpose of higher EDUCATION), written manuscripts, done research, written proposals, attended meetings, been on committees, etc. all while juggling a real life.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: My first thought on the email was "great, another example of favoritism." There appears to be no transparency as to why she was the best candidate (given the weaknesses stated above) given the large pool of applicants.

How can someone lead a University without having performed the main functions that affect each of us every day?

Is there a reason that there is NO opportunity for the actual people that work at the university to hear a talk, have a meeting, anything?

By the time they are at the last step of applications, the constituents always should be able to have a say (whether given real consideration or not).

Even in the nation's, we have had presidential candidates come to the University!

"The only title in our democracy superior to that of President is the title of citizen." Louis Brandeis (1937)

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: prior experience in financial administration of the university

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with the research or teaching missions of the university. (Co-teaching one class on university admin insufficient to qualify as deep experience with teaching.)

References to serving as a CEO of an international company highly overblown - linked in puts the number of employees at 7. Product reviews on the website range between 0 - 5. This does not indicate high volume.

No experience advancing DEIJ efforts or evidence that she cares about these issues at all, either during her time within CSU or working outside it.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Choice is insulting to faculty, students and staff: Weak qualifications, seems that the driving factor is her pre-existing relationship with Frank. Two pathways to university presidencies - academics rising from within, or well-known outsiders who have achieved renown in their fields, often political (e.g. senators, governors). Parsons is neither.

Prior positions at CSU (VP for Ops and Exec Vice Chancellor were appts w/ no search associated). The nepotism that characterized those processes seems repeated here, particularly given the weakness of her qualifications.

No evidence that ""listening sessions"" or other efforts to incorporate wider feedback were integrated in the hiring process. How, exactly, did these efforts impact the choice?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knows the system, organization. The mechanics of it. Is a promoter/lover of CSU. Seems to be a driven and successful person, arguably.

Candidate Weaknesses: not sure how a legal background will help THAT much for this job, except to demonstrate the ability for complex thought. General organization and business acumen will help but a university is a place with different goals than businesses. I do generally agree with the criticism that she might not have the full appreciation of the day to day nature of the academic pursuit and the challenges therein.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This choice was not surprising and yet still very "interesting" indeed.

It has seemed since her beginning at CSU that Ms. Parsons was on an accelerated trajectory, seemed to be quite close to Dr. Frank professionally, and I think the rapid promotion to quite high admin ranks at CSU was noticed by close observers. Admittedly, I do not know her well but have watched this from a distance. The accelerated trajectory could well be because she is just that good.

I don't know anything about the other candidates because it was a closed door situation. Can't compare her to the others.

This pick, for sure, has raised some eyebrows because it has indeed been noticed that she seems to be a Frank favorite, etc. I'm DEFINITELY not suggesting inappropriateness, just a noticeable pick of a "yes" person...?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business background.

Candidate Weaknesses: Administrative background and lack of appreciation/understanding for the workload associated with teaching and research and the relatively low salary associated with it.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The reasoning for the dismissal of the prior president lacks transparency and limits our ability to fully understand what was mis-managed and therefore what skill set is required to be successful in this position. Others have voiced concerns about CSU's propensity to promote from within and I agree that this needs to stop. We have administrators at the Dean's level, VPR, and IRB that are unqualified and frankly, incompetent. This practice of continually promoting from within overlooks more qualified and experienced candidates that could provide better insight on how to implement successful and positive change at CSU.

Currently, there is a problem with how the workload is distributed amongst faculty and how people are compensated for this work. I hope to see a president who addresses these issues and can solve them without raising tuition.

The cost of a college education has become something only the wealthy can afford, so raising tuition and then trying to implement DEISJ amongst this wealthy cohort seems like a wasted effort. By making college affordable, you will attract a more diverse student population.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Legitimately?

Candidate Weaknesses: This candidate is unacceptable. In addition to having no academic experience, she has absolutely zero track record on DEI. The Ripple Effect was a failure and by no means reflects a substantial track record for a university presidential candidate. It is embarrassing that a presidential finalist for a university of this size and prestige in our current times would not be vetted on this critical matter. This is unheard of to bring in a university president with no experience in advocating for and implementing DEI initiatives. It is especially true for a university who touts "inclusive excellence" and is a public land-grant institution. Does this reflect the Board's commitment to DEI? Also, this candidate may have 16 years experience at CSU in upper administration, but she was gifted those roles. She did not go through a search process to become either Vice President for University Operations or to become an Associate Chancellor.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Do you not support DEI efforts? Do you not think it is important to vet candidates for the role of president on the matter of a proven DEI track record? Why were their several Governors on the search committee? This brings into question the judgment and transparency of our System leadership around the presidential search process and finalist selection.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: * Knows CSU and has demonstrated her commitment to the institution

* Legal and operational knowledge

* Personable

Candidate Weaknesses: * Lack of important knowledge/understanding of the academic side of the enterprise (most faculty don't know her - not good given she's an insider)

* Has followed Tony Frank around and there are serious concerns about her independence and ability to effectively represent/lead CSU-Fort Collins (especially when there is disagreement with him)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: A truly uninspired hire that had been rumored for most of the fall. There is a widespread perception that the Chancellor has managed to assemble a docile, bovine board that does pretty much what he wants them to do. Board chair is a joke that has no business in higher-ed oversight, and most board members lack necessary skills/courage to contribute in a meaningful way. Amy is a nice person and has shown competence in her OGC and facilities roles, but what makes an effective president is next level. I doubt she will have the necessary independence to effectively lead CSU and will instead move however the Chancellor/BOG wants her to.

After a national search it is telling that the lone finalist is Amy. Either our institutional reputation is awful and no one wants to come here, or the Chancellor/BOG made the decision a long time ago.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons has never had an academic position at CSU, she has no PhD, she has no research profile, she has no background in teaching. What she has is a history of being hired by Tony Frank for positions that she was never qualified for. She is a blatant example of cronyism, following Tony steadily up the ladder. Now it seems that he wants someone to rubber stamp his decisions. Surely there must have been suitable candidates with rigorous academic and administrative qualifications. The Board of Governors and the search committee should have offered the oversight that Tony Frank, and I'm guessing Rock Miranda, failed to offer.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy Parsons has never had an academic position at CSU, she has no PhD, she has no research profile, she has no background in teaching. What she has is a history of being hired by Tony Frank for positions that she was never qualified for. She is a blatant example of cronyism, following Tony steadily up the ladder. Now it seems that he wants someone to rubber stamp his decisions. Surely there must have been suitable candidates with rigorous academic and administrative qualifications. The Board of Governors and the search committee should have offered the oversight that Tony Frank, and I'm guessing Rock Miranda, failed to offer. CSU deserves better than this.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Her "strengths" are only visible to those who see the university as one more private enterprise moved by the logic of the market, not by the vision that "public" educational institutions should exist to address the social need for, and right to a real, critical and independent education.

Candidate Weaknesses: -No teaching or research background, the pillars of a university that aims to serve the educational needs of the population it purports to serve.

-Proven inclination to see the university as one more enterprise subject to the logic of the market. With her as a leader, the university will continue to pay exorbitant salaries to futbol couches and an ever-growing list of administrators, while paying starving salaries to non TT instructors and keeping unjustified compensation differences among TT faculty in different academic disciplines.

-No commitment to promoting internal equity among key stakeholders of the university.

-No commitment to diversity beyond lip service

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: -It is not good practice to have a single "finalist" in a job search as important as this.

-It is not justified to skip a campus visit by the finalists of this search, so that key stakeholders (students and faculty) can have a real chance to dialogue with them about their vision for the direction of the university.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: He familiarity with CSU and the community.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience and a reputation for autocratic approaches to management and decision making.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This was an unusual search process, as viewed from outside, on several fronts. First, a search committee of this size means that consensus on candidates to move forward in the search process would likely be difficult and lead to finalists that satisfied more than anything. Next, hiding the identity of any candidates, other than a single finalist, had the appearance that the process was based on a predetermined outcome. Additionally, it did not seem that the search criteria was clearly articulated to the University community once the initial feedback attempt was completed.

In the end, the search committee solicited general feedback and comments from the University community on how to identify and select appropriate candidates, but really never acknowledged what they had heard. So when they present the sole finalist in the fashion they did, a stunned University community could only react as they did. How did we get here and why??

After the Joyce McConnell ""debacle"" you would hope that this search would been handled with the utmost of care for the process and the community.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She appears to be dedicated to the University's financial growth, and has extensive experience on the legal side of CSU's operations.

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not have a PhD in a research field, which should disqualify her right away. Second, she has been a donor (how large has not been disclosed), which is a significant ethical problem. It is also apparent that she has no experience on the academic side of university operations, which is a problem in running a R1 university. Finally, her personal connections to the Chancellor are problematic at best, and disqualifying at worst.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Parson's selection through a closed door process with little to no faculty input violates shared governance principles. It was not "robust" in any form that I can see, and so I can only infer that it was an inside hire that violates basic job search law. I fear because of the Board's failure to involve the faculty that Parsons is walking into a losing situation. She will not be seen as a legitimate by the majority of campus, and will always work in the Chancellor's shadow. This will make her tenure incredibly difficult. Furthermore, the Board needs to respect the university's faculty and staff, which they did not in this closed process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Prior CSU experience and brings leadership and organizational knowledge

Candidate Weaknesses: While Amy has extensive leadership experiences and has worked with CSU system, I'm considered that she does not bring an extensive knowledge of research, the tenure process, or extensive teaching experience which is the essence of what a university does. It is not evident in her CV that she has extensive knowledge about our DEI and Inclusive Excellence value. This greatly concerns me given the harm that was caused by the former President.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Did you know that approximately 90 BIPOC/Queer faculty, staff, and administrators have left CSU in the last 2 years due to the climate at CSU? I'm disappointed that someone without extensive DEI experience was not considered. CSU will continue to lose talent to other universities if our future president isn't equip to name and address the hostile campus climate, especially if CSU is an emerging Hispanic Serving Institution. We need a president who is willing to disrupt the status quo. I'm an uninspired by Amy Parsons and fear that more faculty of color will seek other opportunities (myself included) if we ignore our campus climate issues. We can do better because we deserve better.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU and its culture

Has appeared outwardly fair and engaging in the past

Candidate Weaknesses: Not an academic. We have seen the effects of this with our previous president, which is harmful. Those leaders with experience in the tranches can relate and empathize with the conditions, especially as they change rapidly. Without that first-hand understanding of academic life and pressures, there is no way we can expect anyone to first look to our core values as an academic institution to guide leadership.

The experiences with and the work with the Chancellor in the past is a conflict of interest. As much as I admire Dr. Frank, we need a clear separation of perspectives to brighten our diversity and goals.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please do not back down from the concerns about the lack of experience and conflict mentioned above. I think a great deal of Amy, but this is likely a bad situation for both her and us. I understand that these 2 issues have been brought forward, and for a good reason. People have suggested a workaround to bolster this deficiency, but please remember it is a deficiency and one that we will have to deal with. That will be a step backward. We need to move forward boldly. Thanks for the opportunity.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I am unsure of the candidate's strengths based on the fact that I have no official applicant information-- only the information that has been reported in the press.

Candidate Weaknesses: I am unsure of the candidate's weaknesses based on the fact that I have no official applicant information-- only the information that has been reported in the press. I am concerned that someone who has not been an academic will not understand what it is involved in proposing and securing federally-funded grants, conducting research, disseminating research findings, managing hundreds of undergraduate students in a semester, contributing meaningfully to service, and providing stakeholder engagement.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am unsure of the candidate's weaknesses based on the fact that I have no official applicant information-- only the information that has been reported in the press. I am concerned that someone who has not been an academic will not understand what it is involved in proposing and securing federally-funded grants, conducting research, disseminating research findings, managing hundreds of undergraduate students in a semester, contributing meaningfully to service, and providing stakeholder engagement.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I do think universities need more of balance between the academic side and the so-called real world. Too often professors and leaders just have experience on campus, which can be skewed. As I express below, she brings some balance, but the lack of experience with the academic side raises some concerns. The team around her will be important (and hopefully she earns the trust of faculty, which may be tough).

One aspect of the imbalance in higher ed is seeing things too much through a progressive political lens, which I think can be problematic. Public institutions need to be seen as impartial and trusted across perspectives. Not sure about her politics, but this does seem like a move away from more explicit progressive politics from the past few years, which I think is good.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with the academic side or with dealing with faculty. Will need a lot of help there.

Being a university president involves dealing with controversy and politics quite a bit these days as well, not sure of her experience or skills there (kinda like when we brought Graham in for AD, the business world and academic worlds are very different).

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Candidate is clearly successful, smart, and pro-CSU. Her time in the administration is a strength. She knows how some aspects of CSU works.

Candidate Weaknesses: The complete lack of any academic background (beyond admin) and the lack of experience in instruction, curriculum development, and research. These are major weaknesses. In fact, if I were filling our an HR position description, academic background including instructional and research experience would be part of the ""required qualifications"" for this position...not the ""preferred qualifications"".

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The candidate is a lawyer, but has never held any type of professorial position and has no academic or research background. I think that she could be a great candidate for being a Dean of a law school or CEO of a law firm, but not a land grant university. I am sure the reverse would not happen. A history or math professor would never be considered qualified to be Dean of a Law School or the CEO of a legal firm. Effective leadership requires understanding of those you lead as well as the respect of those you lead. Her lack of experience make the former difficult and the latter almost impossible.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate did not accumulate an impressive record while at CSU (e.g., the candidate played a major role in the disastrous INTO agreement) and is being tabbed to lead a major research university when having no experience at all as either a researcher, instructor, or in any element of a faculty position. Moreover, given the need for a fresh perspective moving forward, it is difficult to imagine how that will be achieved by someone who worked with the entrenched power structure at CSU. Thus, it is not apparent why this individual is qualified for the position.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The university press release for this decision made one believe they "doth protest too much", with the refrain of how "open" and "independent" the search was. I know of no precedent for a search of this magnitude taking place without open interviews/vetting of candidates and believe the entire process undermines any outcome. I also leave with this comment: Were the candidate applying for the presidency at any other institution I cannot imagine a scenario where their application would rise to the top in any form. Do not hire this person.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Some familiarity with the running of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of faculty experience; was involved with legal council who has refused the addition of terminology on shared governance in the manual so I am skeptical of her support; Worked in the Chancellor's office so her allegiance to CSU and not the chancellor is suspect - we need a champion, not a lapdog; lack of mention of staff and faculty in her acceptance letter/cover letter; experience is mostly looking at maximizing profits, which is not what CSU exists for; not sure will support the salary adjustment progress being made; lack of any information on her vision for CSU;

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Lack of transparency in the search is troublesome in that there was no way to evaluate the various visions of the applicants. This seems more like a political appointment of someone who was already had been the choice. It has been talked up that there were around 31 members of the search committee, supposedly with members of all employee groups who provided input; and there were open fora to talk comments - being a secretive process, there is no way to know if any of this input was considered in this choice.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of the institution. Understanding of budget.

Candidate Weaknesses: Perceived debts to Tony Frank and consequent lack of independence. While Frank attempts to change the nature of the system, we need someone who is not his lackey. Lack of campus visit and address to faculty & staff; she hasn't tried to win us over, giving the impression that she doesn't care whether we want her or not. She's white, giving the impression that once again, CSU either can't recruit people of color or will give any job to a white person, no matter how unqualified. We don't see ourselves in her, either as an academic or as expression of CSU's commitment to excellence and diversity.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please give our candidate for the presidency the opportunity to win our trust by addressing faculty council before accepting the job. What are her priorities? Why is she interested in the job? Is she willing to take questions from stakeholders? Everybody who has a faculty job got grilled publicly before they got a job offer. Why the kid gloves? The answer has been because ""this is how universities do things now."" Why are we just followers? We're Rams, not sheep.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knowledge of the CSU system
ties to Colorado including industry

Candidate Weaknesses: ZERO experience in teaching, research, or administration (provost, dean).

ZERO experience outside of Colorado or with other higher ed institutions.

The areas in her letter where she claims strengths (e.g., SPUR, stadium) were the vision of Tony Frank, and have not been successful by most measures.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Having a breadth of experience as a faculty member, department head, dean, vice-provost is all important in knowing how to set a vision and build a team to make that vision successful. 85% of all current land grant University presidents came up through the faculty ranks. Focusing among CSU's group of peer institutions, all the current presidents (save one) was a provost, dean, or president before taking on their current presidential appointment. That one exception is Mitch Daniels, a two-term governor who is president at Purdue. None of the current land grant University presidents came from the university operations side. Amy Parsons is lacking the necessary experience to carry out the important responsibilities of the President of the University.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Already familiar with CSU; identifies as being from northern Colorado and so seems likely to understand CSU's context as a land-grant university in this specific area

Candidate Weaknesses: Virtually no faculty experience: once again, we're being presented with a president who principally has experience as an administrator and a business executive, and who therefore seems very likely to treat the university as a business in need of executive management, with little understanding of teaching, research, or the day-to-day realities of being a scholar-teacher. In other words, Ms. Parsons seems like exactly the kind of president CSU *doesn't* need right now. In the communications that have been made public, Ms. Parsons also seems to be making a lot of vapid statements about community while having very little to say about her goals and plans. This evident lack of vision makes me concerned that Ms. Parson either has no vision or that she has a vision that won't be popular with CSU students and faculty.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: From what little information is available, I strongly oppose the appointment of Ms. Parsons as incoming president of CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She seems very familiar with CSU at an administrative level.

Candidate Weaknesses: Her professional degree is not a degree offered at CSU.

She seems very entrenched within the community of people that have expanded the student numbers and administrators at CSU while not focusing the same efforts on faculty.

Having never actually served as a university faculty member, this individual seems unlikely to have an appreciation for the combined service, teaching, and research commitments of faculty at a Tier 1 Research University.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: At numerous times over the past decade, faculty have made suggestions to the University administration that have generally been ignored. There has been an increasing trend to hire university administrators (Presidents, Deans, Department chairs) from the business community to ""manage"" the faculty at this and other universities. This has gradually diminished any appearance of shared governance and shared mission between the University administration and faculty. This lack of voice and shared mission is demoralizing to the faculty. I don't see how this hire will change that trend.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: According to the promotional material Ms Parsons is strong in implementing policies developed by others

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with the primary goals of an R1 university - whether in teaching, research or engagement.

Does not advance DIEJ.

Repetition of Tony Frank's regime that reinforces privatization of CSU

Projects implemented are not particularly creative in terms of our mission. They tend to privatize the University and they are socially and otherwise problematic (Coca Cola, Todos Santos, SPUR, Stadium, INTO)

No national or state level profile

No compelling private sector experience (in terms of creating something and in terms of the company she worked for where she, again, implemented some one else's vision.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am concerned that 12 out of 31 members of the Search Committee were from BOG/alumni/funders and many fewer from faculty and staff.

I am concerned that the Chair of BOG highlights Parsons's brief and limited exposure to the private sector as a desirable element.

In future, representatives of faculty, AP, SC, Students should be as represented as BOG and external stakeholders.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate

- 1) does not have a background that supports her selection as a university president. We need a president, not a CEO!
- 2) touts her successes with projects such as Todos Santos, the Spur, and the stadium (INTO is not mentioned as it was a complete debacle). These high visibility projects are extremely costly and do not contribute directly to the core mission of the university.
- 3) is too close to the Chancellor and BOG to act independently. Her vision is Frank's vision, and we have had quite enough of that.
- 4) has a history of being vindictive.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The BOG should not have had any say about the nature of this survey - that is shameful! This is just more of the same in terms of the process for selecting the new president. Faculty, staff, and students were excluded even from evaluating the finalists (sorry, but listening sessions don't count - they are just a way to make it seem as if we have actual input). This is a public institution of higher education, not a private corporation, and as such "stakeholders" should be able to participate in the decision-making process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knows a lot about operations at CSU Fort Collins, and presumably also the CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: I don't really know enough about the candidate to give a strong opinion. That's more a weakness of the hiring process than of the person.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: 1. The hiring process was faster than what we see in tenure track faculty hires. I suppose that is ok, because the TTF hire is potentially a lifetime appointment, so one wants to avoid mistakes, whereas there is no tenure in an administrative appointment.

2. This is essentially an internal hire. I take the search committee at its word when they say that the best person was found. Still, one wonders how many potential candidates stayed away from this search.

3. The finalist, if selected by the BOG, will start with questions about independence from the system, and will deal with a faculty and staff that are burned out on strategic change initiatives. My guess is that budget priorities need to be stated clearly by leadership before the faculty and staff will re-engage on anything outside of their own efforts to fulfill teaching and research missions.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Many. Most important: (1)She has very little experience INDEPENDENTLY running a very large organization. She has held executive roles but in the big decisions she just did whatever Tony Frank and others told her to do. (2)She is too ""connected"" to Tony Frank and the ""Old Boys"" network. She has proven many times that she will not make decisions independent of Tony Frank and the Board. Their nepotism, old ideas and poor leadership continue to keep CSU's ratings in the second tier and if we don't get new blood, they will continue to proliferate the situations that cause this. We can be better.(3)She is not a nice person to work with and will not be a successful leader. She has offended and done wrong to too many faculty in our institute who will never forget. She can not and will not lead our institute to greatness.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This is a huge mistake. If Tony wants the job back he should take it back. Amy is young enough that this mistake could result in generations of downward pressure on our institute's potential greatness.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has strong ties to CSU and experience in leadership within the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: I feel that her long-term ties to Tony Frank suggest that she will be loyal to his interests. I fear that this jeopardizes the autonomy of the Fort Collins campus.

I am also concerned that she does not have experience as an educator, researcher, and scholar.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: More than anything about Amy Parsons, I am again deeply disappointed with the lack of transparency in the process of selecting a leader for the institution. If the institution really cared about serving the public good, it would hold the hiring process in a public manner with legitimate opportunities for stakeholders to meet with potential candidates before a decision is made.

Offering faculty a chance to express what they want from the search committee through listening sessions before the actual search takes place is a pathetic excuse for shared governance. I sincerely doubt the argument that the institution could not attract a quality candidate if the search was done in public.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Long-time association with CSU. HOWEVER, not the type of background we need in a president.

Candidate Weaknesses: This candidate is a business person/lawyer. While these skills are certainly useful in the position, we are still a university. A university president ABSOLUTELY will better serve if they have long-time experience as a regular tenured faculty member. As a faculty, we should insist on someone with long-time primarily faculty experience as president. That person might also have business/legal experience, but if not, that is why we have legal and assistants.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This candidate is a business person/lawyer. While these skills are certainly useful in the position, we are still a university. A university president ABSOLUTELY will better serve if they have long-time experience as a regular tenured faculty member. As a faculty, we should insist on someone with long-time primarily faculty experience as president. That person might also have business/legal experience, but if not, that is why we have legal and assistants.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU System.

Good professional and legal background.

Candidate Weaknesses: Hasn't worked as a faculty member.

May not be familiar with all the tasks that faculty do, with teaching, research/creative work and service.

Hired in a secretive process.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU needs to be more open about its top leadership and how the new president was selected..

Why was previous president forced out? We still don't know. Yet, CSU paid her millions after she was let go.

Who were the other finalists for the new president's position? If three people were interviewed by the Board of Governors, why aren't those names released?

Why is the Board so secretive about the process and the semi-finalists and finalists? (Calling the selected person the only finalist is just a way to keep the process secretive.) CSU is a public institution funded by tax money and students' tuition. It needs to be open about the process and allow the public (including faculty/staff, students, taxpayers, and the news media) to be observers to the process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU administrative operational system

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of academic and/or higher education experience. No appreciation of the role of public land grant university in serving the community in large.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I would question the reason(s) for lack of interest of qualified individuals for this important position.

I wonder the need for such position when the Chancellor is managing the university. Previously the Chancellor position was almost a symbolic one with the main function to politically promote the university and to work with the governing board members and the president as well. This function has changed since Dr. Tony Frank took over the chancellor position. Thus, there is a need to justify the two positions and their role. I have been with CSU for more 38 years; recent changes in the administrative function are new to us. The Chancellor office and the Board of Directors should elaborate on these changes if we believe in transparency.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Went to CSU and has a background in law and finance.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has almost no educational or research experience. Has not managed a large complex organization (current company as CEO only employs 2-10 people according to company's linked in page). Does not have experience working with diverse groups (e.g., students, faculty, donors, alumni, state government, and various administrators).

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I'm honestly quite surprised that Amy Parsons was even considered for this position. Given her CV, she doesn't have the experience needed for this type of job. The lack of background in higher education is worrying. Her cover letter further emphasizes a lack of understanding of the university landscape and what it would take to manage and lead such a complex organization. The opaque selection process and the apparent close personal relationship between Amy and Tony Frank and Rick Miranda is something that needs to be publically addressed if this hire is to move forward.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: '- Knowledge of CSU administration

Candidate Weaknesses: '- No personal experience with any of the three pillars of the land grant mission (research, teaching, or extension)

- Internal candidate lacks broader perspective necessary to lead a R1 institution within a competitive national context (missed opportunity to bring outside perspective, e.g. someone with experience at an aspirational peer institution).

- Greatest purported accomplishments of the candidate (helping with facilities development) that were noted are either tangential to the land grant mission (football stadium) or "'solutions looking for a problem'" (SPUR and the Mexico facility).

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This was an incredibly dispiriting and disappointing process and outcome. After the shocking lack of transparency and leadership displayed in the abrupt and unexplained dismissal of the last president, I had hoped that transparency and engagement would have been a focus for the Board of Governors in this process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Is familiar with the administrative part of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Has no substantial experience as a faculty member. Her understanding of what faculty workload is like, what is important to faculty, the challenges faculty face, etc. is minimal. This is highly concerning to me.

Yes, she has served in several capacities in CSU's administration. However, she doesn't have a good understanding of a highly significant portion of CSU's mission -- the education portion.

I don't believe she will act independently. Her ties to Tony Frank are too strong. We need someone who will advocate for CSU and is not so tied to the current power structure.

I don't think she will be innovative and I don't see anything that is inspiring in her statements or in having her as the new leader for CSU. After going through the debacle that McConnell's hiring appears to have been, the university deserves an independent, inspiring, leader. That's not what this hire is.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: None

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons has no credentials to become a candidate.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy Parsons was selected out of a corrupt process:

First, the former President was forced to leave after a civilian coup and she was promised to receive millions of dollars. Guess who pays for that? It is unethical and disingenuous for a university to pay millions of dollars to a president to step down for the reasons none of us knows and gives no raise to its faculty. The process was corrupt from the outset.

Second, Rick Miranda said he was not a candidate. Then, we saw his name among the candidates. The process was not transparent.

Third, why is former President Frank always behind the scenes? Did he stage all this? Why did he send an email about the former president stepping down before she did herself? Was she fired? if so, why? The whole process was shady from the beginning. Former President Frank needs to stop acting like CSU is his private property.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Law degree, knowledge of the CSU system, friendly with the Board of Governors.

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not seem to have the minimum qualifications to run a major research university. She has never worked as a professor, nor has she worked in some kind of obviously similar role (education, research, management of a large institution). By Pres. Miranda's own description, she will require on the job training at a level that seems inappropriate to the important of the position. I do not understand how a national search led us to this candidate.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This candidate is a poor fit to run a not for profit public land-grant university. Her main achievements seem to be related to building things, including the Canvas stadium which was very strongly opposed by numerous CSU and Fort Collins communities. How the BoG finds her appropriate eludes me, except perhaps that she has had a long-term working relationship with them and with Chancellor Frank.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: I am concerned that someone with no faculty experience - research or teaching, will be leading our university where primary goals are research and teaching. She does not have experience outside of CSU and cannot possibly bring a larger/broader vision to CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: How is it that we have settled on a person with no research or teaching experience to lead an institution of people whose primary goals are research and teaching? Being an insider, Ms Parsons will likely not be able to bring a larger, more global perspective/vision to CSU. Without strong leadership experience at other universities and experience in the trenches of research and teaching, Ms Parsons does not have the track record to help us grow. This is not what we need, especially in a time when higher education is on the decline. I liken this to the election of President Trump, someone with little experience, to run our country. Let us not make that mistake.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The candidate has clear strengths and extensive experience in management of large University-related projects and budgets.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience, as faculty member, chair, dean, provost, etc., that calls into serious question as to whether the candidate understands the academic/research enterprise of the university. Such experience is expected for an R1 research university president and was a key requirement of the job posting.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I do not support the hiring of Amy Parsons as the 16th president of CSU. It is surprising that CSU was not able to attract a strong candidate with academic experience (i.e., someone that has served as provost at another 4-year R1 university).

With respect to process, although the recent press and BOG comments suggests buy-in and transparency, the process still comes across opaque, particularly given that CSU employees and the public were only provided with a single finalist name.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Obviously a highly intelligent, motivated, and high performing individual. Long term ties to the university, familiarity with the fiscal landscape of higher education in Colorado.

Candidate Weaknesses: Only in academic administration, long term ties with the university, familiarity with the fiscal landscape of higher education in Colorado, and thus comfort with a bad situation.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The choice of Amy Parsons is a missed opportunity to bring in new talent to the university. While the comfort and familiarity between Ms. Parsons and the Board of Governors may provide some level of comfort and contentment, it also means that Colorado State University will stay where it is: a middling state university that serves its mission adequately, but can't extend beyond its regional impact, limited because of lack of resources. Colorado State University stays parochial, running as hard as it can to stay in place. Go rams.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU. Has managerial experience (most former faculty are not very good at being managers). I hear she is a good listener -- that is all you need. Committed to CSU -- a Ram through and through.

Candidate Weaknesses: I see no weaknesses.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am a faculty member. I do research. I teach. I do service. I do NOT need a president who has also done all of those same things. I need a listener. Someone who is open-minded. Someone who is a good critical thinker. Tim Cook's (an excellent CEO) background was in supply chain and procurement. He did not come from Apple's area of core competence - design and marketing. But he listens and is a strong critical thinker. I believe that a legal background is a great critical thinking grounding. If the search committee and BoG think that Amy Parsons is a good listener, a good manager of people, and a good critical thinker, then ignore this faculty dust-up and hire her.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows the CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: Only knows the CSU system.

No applicable experience beyond positions at CSU, all of which were highly mentored through (former) President Tony Frank.

No experience in leadership role at R1 university beyond highly mentored experiences.

No applicable experience in mentoring others (peers, students, etc)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This hire, like so many others of late, demonstrates more egregious nepotism at CSU. We now have most senior level positions, that remain, either friends of the chancellor (Frank), the former Provost/current interim President (Miranda) or the VPR (Rudolf) and many high level accommodation hires without any search committees, or shell search committees. The end result of which is a "yes man" hierarchy without a voice for those representing minority groups or interests, and punitive measures for, well, dissidents, of the CSU state. The whole thing sickens me.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: None that I see that warrants her being favored and selected by the board of Governors to be our next university president. And given the scope of her experience (inside and outside CSU).

Candidate Weaknesses: Essentially, a blinding lack of the actual academic experience nor demonstrated understanding in either classroom instruction or research. Simply being a CEO of a company is NOT sufficient credentials for the position in question. And clearly another glaring weakness is her close association with Tony Frank, which compromises her suitability and undermines the independence that a forceful university president needs so as to govern this university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is crucial that your decision to hire Amy Parsons be reconsidered and at the very least the CSU Board of Governors need to be share with this university the exact reasons for favoring her over all the other candidates.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The candidate has some experience teaching at the university. This will help her to understand one part of our mission at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: As far as I can tell, the candidate has zero research experience. I find this to be unacceptable at an R1 university and I think that the Board of Governors should declare a failed search. It's hard to imagine that this candidate will take the research enterprise seriously which will make it more difficult to compete for funding and attract top-tier talent to the university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I find this selection unacceptable and I think that the Board of Governors should declare a failed search. We just had a lawyer (McConnell) as the university president and it was clear that she did not understand what happens at an R1 university. I fear that this new candidate will share the same viewpoint as our previous president.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business connections in and around Colorado. Experience in law.

Candidate Weaknesses: Minimal teaching experience. No mentioning of commitment to inclusion, diversity, or equity.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: You say ""Following recruitment of a deep and diverse pool of potential candidates, the committee considered and interviewed applicants, and then arrived at a clear consensus on three qualified candidates, each of whom the committee felt could do the job"" and yet the candidate is a white woman and on the news posting there's no mentioning of her commitment to equity, diversity, or social justice. Even the comments of committee members are void of any mentioning to how Parsons will support the university in that effort. But perhaps that is not the job of a president of a university. Maybe they are essentially a CEO of a company focused on revenue. In that case, she sounds perfect.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has a deep familiarity with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: She will not be able to appreciate demands on faculty since she is not faculty. She is too much of an insider and, for all practical purposes, is Tony Frank's hand-picked successor. She will not be able to bring a broad perspective or new ideas from other portions of academia.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The search process was flawed from the start. There were too many non-CSU people on the search committee (i.e., donors) and not enough faculty or students. With the search being closed, it was an opportunity for Tony Frank and the Board of Governors to make sure that they could select the next president. The email to faculty and the Source articles were sure signs that they were trying to "sell" Parsons to CSU. I work in King Tony Frank's personal fiefdom. Or, to be kind, I have deep concerns about faculty governance.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU operations. Good working relationship with Chancellor Frank who clearly maintains a tight grip over all major activities at CSU Fort Collins. Any substantive progress in any direction is dependent upon such a relationship. Completed major projects at CSU whether or not one considers them positive steps, e.g., Canvas Stadium, Todo Santos, Semester at Sea, INTO, major building projects.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of understanding of the complex faculty role in research, teaching, and service. A very limited academic record, including independent research, publication, student mentoring, grant writing, course development. Unqualified for a full professor position in any CSU department. No experience as a faculty member, department chair, dean or provost.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: BoG need to weigh strengths and weaknesses as above and make their decision.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Former CEO-- a university should not be treated as a business to maximize profits and customer satisfaction, it should educate students. She has no experience balancing teaching and research efforts. She also has close ties to the current interim administration, which makes me believe that the cronyism we all thought ended with the hiring of Joyce McConnell is back.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I do not support the hiring of Amy Parsons. I also do not look favorably on the recent Source article lauding the university search process which is propaganda. Why is this University so afraid of being transparent and honest? I also think that signing the NDA with about the firing of Joyce McConnell was not in the best interest of the University-- we have no idea what happened and what type of power is being executed behind closed doors.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has extensive experience with CSU and CSU system. Cares about CSU based on her extensive history with it.

Candidate Weaknesses: Teaching experience really cannot be counted as faculty experience. However, that's not necessarily a weakness because the Provost is typically the senior "academic" administrator and thus will have the requisite faculty experience and knowledge.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I have felt for the past few years that I care more about this university than did the higher administration of it. My sincere hope is that Amy Parsons will bring back that deeper concern and regard for CSU. My hope is that she will also help us outwardly engage more (such as with APLU) since it seems we've become more inwardly focused with a "what's in it for me and my faculty trajectory" kind of place rather than "how do we serve others."

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: leadership experiences

familiar with CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: 1. has not held an academic position

2. no indication of supporting undergraduate teaching or CCAF teaching faculty as a priority

3. familiarity with running a research program?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: the process of hiring was kept very quiet from the faculty and the finalist announcement seemed to come out of the blue. why were other finalists not identified? who else was interviewed? the process was very opaque and not transparent. what will the pay for the new president be? what is the contract arrangement? firing a past president without any explanation and then having to pay out a huge salary for the remaining is quite wasteful and irresponsible use of funds. these funds should otherwise be going to student education and faculty and staff salaries.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: * solid honest (?) character with strong CSU roots

* good connection in Colorado, maybe ability to attract donors (?)

Candidate Weaknesses: * CSU roots (?), indicating a potential inability to not include her private and financial interests

* experience in leading *large* ""non-profit"" organizations

* involvement in building stadium and spur, which, in my eyes are not helping, even hindering CSU's core mission of teaching and research

* no experience in CSU's core mission of teaching and research --> this is really big, i cannot think of any excuse for this (I don't know how common that is among US universities)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The whole process is a joke, I cannot take the board serious anymore. I think we should know why the old president was fired and have a more qualified candidate for this position.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Legal background, familiarity with the CSU and Colorado environment, entrepreneurial and leadership experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience in academic life, which is needed to support the central function and role of CSU, which is education AND research. Knowing that Mrs. Parsons was one of the key people behind the on-campus stadium, it is possible that similar ventures and infrastructure will be supported more than research. The future CSU leader, from a research faculty perspective, should aim at making CSU more known for its groundbreaking research and innovation, tied with an education that students receive here, and the business model related to athletics or infrastructure should not be overshadowing this.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I wonder why there were no more candidates that were considered.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Amy Parsons clearly has experience with CSU administration

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons did not move through the faculty ranks. I believe the experience of starting as a faculty member and being promoted through to administration is critical to forming the vision of the university. One gains experience dealing with the different academic units on campus. Currently, 85% of all current land grant university presidents came up through the faculty ranks.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I believe the experience of starting as a faculty member and being promoted through to administration is critical to forming the vision of the university. One gains experience dealing with the different academic units on campus. Currently, 85% of all current land grant university presidents came up through the faculty ranks.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: CSU Administrator, taught classes in the graduate school, legal experience, long time CSU connection.

Candidate Weaknesses: No real university experience outside of CSU. What breadth of experience does she bring without it? As a lawyer, it will only deepen the role of council on this campus which at times seemed to an extraordinarily conservative approach to decision making which hampered many decision making tasks from administration in moving forward for action. Not sure she has had enough experience as a full fledged faculty member to see that groups perspective of the University.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Interesting choice, but once again, the process may cause many people to not want to take the candidates lead as they feel there was not enough inclusion and transparency in the search process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: The candidate appears to understand the internal workings of the University based on their extensive experience working with the CSU system.

Candidate Weaknesses: I question the decision to elect Amy to the position of president due a lack of cohesion between the CSU mission statement and the experience listed in Amy's CV. There is an obvious missing piece for a leader who makes decisions that impact faculty and researchers at the university. Amy has no experience with either teaching or research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I also question the decision from the perspective of the current political climate at the university. With labor movements on the rise around the country, especially at universities; hiring a CEO/lawyer to serve as University President is a questionable choice to say the least.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: I hear a lot of senior faculty and administrators voicing concern that the candidate does not have the requisite experience for the position. It seems logical that the person in charge of a University should have held a faculty position at some point. From my read, the candidate seems more like she will be good at networking and fundraising than leading a University. Finally, within the departments we are asked to think about diversity when hiring. While the candidate represents CSU and Colorado, she does not seem diverse.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I'm a lowly assistant professor so I don't have a sense of what upper administration does, but this person makes me feel like upper administration is running a business, which is not what we are intending to do in our departments.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Internal, business-oriented

Candidate Weaknesses: Never held a teaching or research role

Never run an organization greater than 7 employees

Internal

Appears to have potential conflicts of interest with the Chancellor, who was her supervisor for a long while.

Very limited leader-ship experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This entire search process seems to have been a joke. I was always skeptical of the notion that the Board of Governors was interested in "community input" during the search process (given that they fired our previous president without any input and have yet to release any explanation), but the result of this search process just confirms it. They could care less what their employees think. They will hire someone who appears to just be a lackey and can act as a hack for Tony Frank.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: familiarity with CSU, connections with current CSU leaders and important players in the community, former CSU student.

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not have a PhD and she has no academic or research experience. While these may not be essential requirements at some institutions, I believe they are very important at an R1 institution like CSU.

I am concerned that her prior work at CSU-FC was as Deputy General Counsel which is a job focused on protecting the institution from legal liability often at the expense of core academic freedoms and intellectual values. The GC's position on a broad array of issues and controversies at CSU often runs counter to the faculty and student positions on these issues, and I worry that she will bring that bias into this job.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business orientation can be a strength and a weakness. The candidate does have background at CSU, which is also a strength (knowledge of systems) and weakness (same old same old).

Candidate Weaknesses: Business orientation can be a strength and a weakness. The university is not a business. We should not be thinking of creating business systems within the academy in terms of having revenue generating units. If the faculty wanted to start a business, they could very well do so and make more money than through the university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We need someone with academic (e.g., teaching, mentoring) and research (e.g., funded research program, research publications). We do need someone that can help with the creation of clear policies and procedures that are transparent.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has history with CSU so knows some things about the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of academic background makes this candidate unaware of the primary roles that academic faculty have. That is, this candidate has no experience teaching, no experience performing and communicating scholarly work, no experience seeking and getting funding for research, etc.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: When this candidate was announced as the front runner, my immediate thoughts were:

-- Tony Frank chose one of his cronies.

-- Once again, the process of searching for a new CSU president was done in a completely opaque way.

-- I wish that we had an open search process where faculty, staff, and students could participate in an authentic way, that is, where our opinions actually mattered.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I do not think that I can comment on this because I have not seen this candidate's or for that matter any other candidate's application materials. I do not rely on heresay or rumors to judge anybody.

Candidate Weaknesses: I do not think that I can comment on this because I have not seen this candidate's or for that matter any other candidate's application materials. I do not rely on heresay or rumors to judge anybody.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: As long as I have no clear indication that the search process was unfair and biased in any way, I would give the search committee the benefit of the doubt that they did the best job possible.

I am sure any newly appointed faculty at CSU would not want to be prejudged based on potential heresay, rumors, or conspiracy theories.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Though I don't find this a strength, some might find that the candidate's experience in the private sector is a plus.

Candidate Weaknesses: Does not have research or teaching experience in higher education. This may undermine her ability to understand the needs of faculty and students. Higher education needs are not the same as those of a privately-run business. I am not convinced it is the best strategy to treat the university as a revenue generating entity, which is how the board of governors seems to want to manage the university as they move forward with this candidate. It will increase inequalities and continue a path of bad investments (e.g. Todos Santos campus, the Stadium) that have contributed little to our Land Grant mission.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Entrepreneurship; but not helpful from an "academic" perspective.

Candidate Weaknesses: While the candidate seems to be an accomplished individual both for her endeavors within and outside of CSU, I have a hard time understanding how those accomplishments make her a finalist for the president position in a Tier 1 higher education institution.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: If the goal of the Board of Governors is to convert a 150 year old academic institution to corporate America, this is an ideal candidate. However, I still would like to believe that is not the case and academics DO matter. Unfortunately, this candidate does not have the academic background/credentials to run a Tier 1 ACADEMIC institution. That is research, teaching, outreach, and service...

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience at CSU. Knows the institution, or at least the non-academic side of it.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons would be an outlier among university presidents. She is neither an academic nor a former politician with a big public profile. She cannot be a leader when it comes to the primary educational mission of CSU. Her application letter made it clear that her only vision is building more buildings. It barely mentions academics, faculty or students. Her appointment is clearly cronyism -- she is Tony Frank's friend, & that matters more than her lack of meaningful qualifications.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I have heard from many colleagues about the appointment of Amy Parsons. All of them view it as outrageous and unacceptable.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No actual academic experience of significance, which means no significant experience with teaching classes, writing proposals, supervising undergraduate or graduate students, procuring research funding, or writing scholarly articles based on research.

Another president with a law degree at a university that does not have a law program.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Really concerned about the future direction of CSU, given that the candidate has no significant academic experience and, therefore, little first-hand knowledge about the day-to-day duties of faculty and staff. Hiring another university president with a law degree at a university that does not have a law program makes no sense to me.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Obviously very familiar with aspects of CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: No real academic credentials, so her expertise with the various aspects of CSU is very limited.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: In contrast to what has been stated publicly about how the faculty were engaged in the process through listening sessions and surveys, I for one do not remember ever being informed about how I could provide feedback. More importantly, the secretiveness of the process is the antithesis of what is required when hiring a faculty member. We have no idea how many candidates were interviewed/vetted and what their credentials were. Consequently, this looks very much like a Tony Frank hand picked President. I guess CSU is now officially an autocracy.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows the CSU system.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has never been a faculty member and doesn't really understand what we do or what our challenges are.

Probably just a yes woman to Tony Frank as she has a long standing history with him.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Clearly this was planned from the beginning when President O'Connell was dismissed. While Amy Parson's has done a good job in her various roles at CSU, she is clearly not qualified for the position as president, she is just someone that will do whatever Tony Frank wants. It is very disappointing that she is the only option we are given. I'm sure the Board of Governors will rubber stamp this decision as they haven't stood up to Tony yet. Here we go with just more of the same...

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU administrative structure

Candidate Weaknesses: Not an academic. No trajectory through the institution that would make her a great advocate for people outside the administration building.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I don't object to someone from inside CSU being elevated to the top spot, but it should be someone who rose from faculty ranks and has a PhD. The concept of faculty governance of this institution is critical to maintain. I don't feel this candidate can offer this.

There are many people all over the institution who feel they cannot work successfully with this candidate.

Second thoughts should be given to installing a president who generates this much criticism and division this early in the process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU well based on holding various positions.

Is well connected to the Board and Tony, obviously

Bright and Articulate spokesperson for the University

Same degree as previous president.

Knows budgets

Will be a consummate fund raiser.

Candidate Weaknesses: No faculty experiences

She is well connected to Tony and the Board, so she won't rock the boat with them.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Faculty Council: Although I know you all are taking this various seriously, but all of this is simply spitting at the wall, it will make no difference. This is who Tony wants and this is who CSU will get. I know you all feel like you have to make noise based on the selection and process, but it noise signifying nothing

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU, strong operational background

Candidate Weaknesses: No clue what it means to be a faculty, teach a class, run a research group, etc. This has been a recipe for disaster at all universities that have tried it around the US.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please reconsider this hire or do something to ensure the president is required to surround herself with faculty of all types to ensure she at least has some understanding of what life is like as a faculty. She also has to address the ridiculous underpayment of faculty and staff at this university. We are a laughing stock among our peers and are and will lose key parts of the university if this is not treated like the emergency that it is.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience/former employment at Colorado State University.

Leadership experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: No education or employment experience outside the state of Colorado.

No academic research/scholarship experience.

CV implies success with addressing faculty and staff salary equity and retention, however, facts reveal limited remedies by CSU administration to address salary inequities during her appointment as VP for University Operations. The issue of gender salary inequity remains and faculty and staff salaries, in general, have not kept pace with peer institutions.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: An individual with more diverse academic leadership experiences would be better suited for this position.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: It is quite concerning that this candidate has virtually no apparent experience in teaching, research, or extension, all fundamental aspects to the mission of our university. How can she truly relate to what we do without this experience?

It is also unclear if previous positions at CSU were through competitive searches or via appointments... if she was simply appointed by the past president, then this feels like cronyism... I do not have all the facts, but I believe that this might be the general perception and it may limit her effectiveness as president.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I appreciate the due diligence of the faculty council in this matter.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU and the CSU system. Understands the state political issues for funding.

Candidate Weaknesses: Does NOT understand the TWO KEY ASPECTS of our University: Research and Teaching. This is not something one can just pick-up. This is a big problem. We saw how Joyce's lack of understanding of teaching and research negatively impacted CSU. Why is the Board repeating the mistake?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: IF we are not able to over-come the limits of this candidate, there MUST BE a Provost who understands TEACHING AND RESEARCH. Please consider retain Jan Nerger in this role. Moreover, folks who understand Teaching and Research MUST BE empowered to ACT for decisions in these areas.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: We know nothing about the strengths or weaknesses of this candidate because this has been a totally opaque and bizarre process.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am a productive faculty member with large grants and a strong teaching/mentoring record. I am sad to say that I am on the job market this year. CSU students are wonderful, as is the land grant mission, but the values of this institution in terms of transparency and community dialogue do not align with what I expect from a large public university. Parsons being selected for the President position is the just the latest of several decisions that seem to reflect nepotism and sidelining of faculty and student interests.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: My main issue is not with the candidate, but with the process employed to select the candidate and the lack of transparency. If the candidate is so exceptional, why not bring her to campus along with two other finalists? Give her and two other candidates the opportunity to present their view to the campus-wide community. The mystery surrounding the process leads many to raise questions, spread rumors, and distrust the decisions of the administration. Too often at this university, individuals are presented as unicorns, so exceptional that nobody else can compete. This is a kind of magical thinking that does not serve us or our students well.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: previous experience at CSU - knows Spur, passion for CSU, politically savvy, solid relationship with Chancellor Frank and BOG. Really smart - empathic - analytic - good sense of humor (she'll need that)

Candidate Weaknesses: Lacks academic experience (how dept, colleges function day to day) ... president rarely deal with those issues.... that's why we have deans and DH/Chairs.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Faculty don't pick presidents - only sitting Deans should have input

Let her get started - We need Provost, and VPE, these are critical - with good support she'll grow into the job.

The reputation of the institution with public is critical - let's move ahead with President Parsons.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Given that all the information provided is based on what's available online, I don't feel that I can judge the candidate. I understand that this search has to be somewhat 'secretive' to encourage many candidates to apply, however, I wonder if anyone has asked the candidates if that truly is important to them? I feel that the recent news stories actually puts this likley partnership off to the wrong start. It would have been nice to avoid this. Maybe the rules regarding these searches can be changed and allow for candidates to have open forums if they wish to do so? Or perhaps some other way for the CSU community to have greater input?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Her lack of academic experience as faculty alone shouldn't be an insurmountable barrier, but what is troubling is that her only experience in academia is at CSU. That, combined with her history of working closely under Tony Frank, casts serious doubt on her ability to act independently and bring in or value outside perspectives on key issues facing higher education.

If I were faculty who's research resulted into a patentable invention that would benefit from corporate sponsorship, I'd be thrilled about this decision, but the reality is that is not most faculty. CSU is an institution of higher education, not corporate endeavor.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am looking forward to someone with an open mind becoming President of CSU. The University has a major problem in the way they treat NTT faculty. The dean(s) of the College of Business unabashedly go out of their way to obstruct the promotions, work load and quality of life of NTT faculty. Research is important, but a high quality education is even more important and that is primarily driven by supporting NTT faculty. Having a President with no research background is actually a monumental plus for the majority of the constituents of CSU, and students should be enthusiastically thanking the search committee for this selection.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The candidate has effectively no personal experience in the foundations of CSU's mission: teaching and research. The candidate's letter largely neglected the importance of research, and the candidate appears to lack vision and experience in this regard. Basic on conversations I have had, there is a perception that the candidate was picked for the position not because of their experience in research and teaching, but because of their close ties to the chancellor's office. I think there is a risk that the hire could lead to the loss of high caliber researchers and a degradation of CSU's reputation in research.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Established knowledge of CSU through previous affiliations. 'Local' candidate

Candidate Weaknesses: Mixed reviews/accomplishments in previous roles with the University including some failed practices/initiatives. Lack of experience at this level of academic institution leadership, as well as lack of experience in teaching and research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The candidate's previous roles at CSU indicates a continuation of old ways of operating, rather than a change going forward, which a lot of people are looking for. While the candidate's past experience and knowledge of CSU can be listed as a strength, it's not necessarily a good thing if we are looking for change.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of familiarity with academia/experience as an academic. Seems to be more focused on finances rather than academia. Seems to be a status quo pick by the Board of Governors and Tony Frank. Unsure if the candidate will stand-up to BOG and Tony Frank to make important decisions--especially decisions that support the CLA and faculty more generally.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Very concerned about the lack of CLA/humanities on the search committee. Very concerned about this being a pick by the BOG that maintains status quo and emphasis on the business and athletics side of CSU while ignoring the academic side, especially CLA.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: History of interaction with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic preparation consistent with the position

No experience as an academic in any capacity

No experience base to lead, or set vision, for an R1 University

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is unclear what CSU and its Board of Governors view as the role of a University President for CSU. However, based on the chosen candidate, that role envisioned seems inconsistent with that of a president of any University, and especially is inconsistent for a University considered an R1. Universities should be led by a President with a significant, nationally recognized academic record in the classroom and in research.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows Tony Frank.

Experience with legal affairs in academia.

Knows the CSU system.

Younger person, and likely to be dynamic.

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching experience to speak of.

No research experience.

Limited understanding of student learning.

Limited understanding of academic environment.

Perception that she is too close to Tony, and there to protect him.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Do not push her through unless she receives favorable support from faculty and broader academic community. If she faces a fair amount of opposition, extend the search and present 2 to 3 alternative candidates. If they are all bad, she may then have a chance ... as lesser evil.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with the institution

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience in research and grantsmanship, one of the central functions of a Research I institution

Insular perspective -- as an internal hire, she does not bring new or fresh ideas

Insular perspective -- all of her degrees have been earned in the state of Colorado, again, not bringing new or fresh ideas

Lack of experience as a tenured faculty member

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: If CSU wants to position itself as a leading research/land-grant institution, then it needs to seek leaders who have top-notch credentials and leadership experience and who will breathe new fresh ideas into the institution.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She's a woman with experience in this community

Candidate Weaknesses: Being business focused makes me worried about how she'll take up concerns and values in The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) especially regarding budgetary adjustments and strategic plans already underway. We've seen the degradations of how public universities fall under the spell of neoliberal profit making which has divested students and faculty of fair and rich opportunities for education and enrichment.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please keep in mind the work already underway to bring CLA faculty, admin and graduate students into the nationwide fold of sustainable pay and just treatment.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Interest in diversity of thought; long background at CSU; from Colorado (and WY), so should better understand the local climate, which might increase length of tenure; entrepreneurial experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of national recognition

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please continue to emphasize the importance of diversity of thought. Colorado State University should be a space where employees and students can openly hold a wide variety of opinions, assuming students/employees share these opinions in respectful, appropriate ways. People who are more conservative politically and/or who come from a religious background should be welcome at CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: apparent ability to get projects off the ground

Candidate Weaknesses: lack of ANY academic experience (teaching, research, etc)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is very difficult to assess the candidate's strengths and weaknesses with this secretive process. The lack of any academic experience is not a minor weakness, it is an enormous one that would need to be counterbalanced by extreme strength in other areas.

That said, my largest concern is the proximity to the former administration and the appearance of nepotism. First woman president fired by her predecessor with no explanation provided, and is then replaced by his protoge. Appalling.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Prior experience at CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Zero background in teaching, research, and mentorship of students.

The last job as CEO of what appears to be a website brokering goods between Italian luxury brands and consumers looks weak. I would be far more impressed if this was a more substantial company. How many employees did she manage exactly? I suspect very few. How successful was this company apart from the opaque language she used with respect to a "fast growing" "international" company. There is something about the potential overstatement of the importance/relevance of this work that causes me pause.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: It is hard to tell what their strengths are outside of business interests. If we keep running the university through the lens of business only, we will lose sight of what education is for.

Candidate Weaknesses: They are an intimate insider of previous administrations. This goes against the whole idea of diversity and inclusion. Why is an insider seen as necessary? Is this really the only person?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The fact there is not a transparent and diverse process where we can get a plethora of candidates outside the system is shocking. Do we also really need to keep populating our administration with lawyers and business people?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Legal training.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of

Higher Education background.

Doctorate.

Grad School experience.

Classroom teaching experience.

Mentorship experience.

Grant Writing/funding distribution.

FOCO (or any) notable community involvement.

Any effort to meet with university/community general population.

PSD involvement.

Town Hall discussions.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please reconsider this seemingly myopic selection.

Re-open the search.

Ensure 3-4 finalists make traditional and important campus visits.

It would appear more time and consideration is being given the UHP director search than regards CSU president.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU system - at least as it has operated.

Candidate Weaknesses: Role she had at CSU is not sufficient for running a university. Effectively an inside candidate - why not bring someone with more appropriate experience rather than someone with strong ties to previous CSU administrations.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The candidate is effectively an inside candidate - why not bring someone with more appropriate experience rather than someone with strong ties to previous CSU administrations. Were there no other suitable candidates from outside of CSU? It is unlikely that new and interesting ideas will come with this candidate.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Administrative experience and connection with CSU. She would be able to hit the ground running right away with very little transition time

Candidate Weaknesses: LACK of academic experience including teaching and research

Personal background might bring up questions about her commitment to DEI

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The selection process has been very "closed". For example there were no open forums available for us to learn more about the finalists and the survey available on the president search website was not anonymous. It feels that this is a search only for formality and the candidate was determined to begin with.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows & endorses CSU, FoCo, N CO, state of CO.

Enthusiastic supporter of CSU activities & culture.

Extensive admin experience at CSU.

Private sector for-profit experience.

CSU experience from work-study job through undergrad degree through lower then higher levels of CSU administration.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lacks PhD-level experience conducting R1 university research/teaching/outreach.

Higher ed degree is in law.

Lacks leadership experience at level of university president.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Search process was closed, without sufficient opportunity for input from faculty and other parts of CSU community.

Employee Classification: Miembro de la facultad docente

Candidate Strengths: Ha trabajado en CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No tiene un título de doctorado

No tiene experiencia docente

No tiene experiencia en investigación académica

Vision de director ejecutivo con fines de lucro que no concuerda con la visionde una universidad publica

No es conocida por el grupo docente de CSU

Falta de compromiso en diversida, equidad y justicia

Falta de interes en los estudiante de posgrado en la aplicacion

Falta de interese en los trabajdores de CSU en la aplicacion

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Abran nuevamente la busqueda de candidatos nacionales e internacionales. Dado prioridad a alguien que conozca y tenga experience en la acadmia, investigacion y servicio y con un Doctorado.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU, high conceptual and strategic skills

Candidate Weaknesses: Potential to continue operational and budgetary status quo as a longtime CSU professional.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Many departments on this campus have critical needs. However, in my opinion, the Facility Maintenance department is seriously underperforming and understaffed. From a leadership, management, staffing, and operational standpoint, they're having a very tough time. I'm not in Facilities Maintenance but their work critically impacts the resources I manage, which, in turn, impacts physical resources critical to student success.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has management experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate has little to non-existent research, teaching, and service experience. I am not sure the candidate understands what the academic mission is.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is shocking that we have a solo finalist. How is this even acceptable in this day and age. The process is completely and utterly flawed. The process comes across a predetermined, biased, and deeply flawed. We have multiple finalist candidates for every position advertised at the University. Having a solo finalist is terrible and just has absolutely no credibility.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Lawyer, CSU affiliated

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching or research experience. No experience in managing a multi-campus, multi-structured, and other complex institutions.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is really a suspect that for such a large and well-regarded institution such as CSU, the community does not get to choose from at least 3 finalists. The search should be failed, and a new search should be conducted to ensure proper process. A fair and transparent process is not only good for the organization, but also to the person who will become president, which could be the current candidate.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business background

Knowledge of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching or research experience, which is rare for an R1

Inside candidate. In academia, inside candidates are not praised. The idea is that you hire people who can bring knowledge of effective programs and initiatives at other universities. It makes us look less competitive in R1 world.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Because she is an inside candidate with no research experience, we look less competitive in comparison to R1s. I'm sure she has strengths, but I was hoping for someone who would bring new aspects from other universities.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Safe pick for BOG and Tony. They have worked with candidate-select.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate-select has not worked at the point of spear that comes from being a president. CEO from a small start up does not have the complexity as an R1 university. Also, a big part of being a CSU President is being community-focused. Her relationships are Denver, not Fort Collins nor the state of Colorado.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: How many candidates were from CSU-FC, past and present employees (Faculty, staff, admin pro)? How did they fair in the process regarding strengths and weaknesses?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I think her long history with CSU is a major strength! She has experience as a student, CSU VP, vice chancellor of the CSU system and now a parent of a CSU student. It is clear that Amy Parsons cares deeply about CSU and wants to see us grow and thrive. I think the search process was open and thorough. I have confidence that she will support the students, faculty and staff at CSU.

A president can support diversity even if they are white. A president can support teaching and research without having direct experience in those areas.

Candidate Weaknesses:**Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:**

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Long history working in CSU system. Know strengths and weaknesses.

Candidate Weaknesses: Does not have an academic background. I don't see how her leadership will be effective without more in-depth understanding of the University's core missions. Also, a legal background does not seem to bring many alternative advantages.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Does not have an academic background. I don't see how her leadership will be effective without more in-depth understanding of the University's core missions. Also, a legal background does not seem to bring many alternative advantages.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Institutional knowledge

Candidate Weaknesses: She isn't an academic

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: As a non-tenure track faculty, I am not sure if I should be excited that a non-academic is president or wildly annoyed. If non-tenure track faculty are not allowed to hold administrative positions because we aren't tenured, why can a non-academic hold the HIGHEST administrative position?

I hope that Amy's nomination opens up opportunities for other non-tenure track folks to serve in administrative positions. However, based on historical trends, I wouldn't hold my breath waiting for this.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience or expertise in core functions of research, Extension or teaching

No strong relationships with key federal agency and funding partners (NSF, NIH, DOE, USDA)

In my limited interactions, had no deep understanding of our Centers and programs

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please consider how this continued hiring from within and firing of leaders from outside the system is perceived by our national peers

We will not get good talent in future hiring pools if we keep signaling we will only find internal hires acceptable and retainable

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience -- none. Does not have a PhD. Has no teaching experience. No research experience. We need a change from the Tony Frank era and she is an extension of the Tony Frank era. She is not independent from BoG.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We need new leadership and new ideas, not a continuation of the Tony Frank era. And this new leadership absolutely has to have academic experience and university leadership experience. Amy Parsons does not check any of the boxes that CSU needs right now. This would be a disaster of a hire.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The lack of academic experience, and particularly experience as a faculty member, is concerning for someone leading the education, research, service, engagement, and outreach mission of CSU. I am further concerned about the perception of nepotism and resulting potential blind spot to the rampant conflict of interest that already exists at the higher levels of CSU administration. I am also deeply concerned about the insufficient attention paid to issues of diversity, equity, inclusion, and justice in the applicant's application.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business skills, legal skills, knowledge of CSU, fundraising, success building complex teams and initiatives.

Candidate Weaknesses: Limited experience with research, extension, or teaching

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I view the President's role as largely one of a CEO and believe Parsons brings many of the critical skills we need. Because she is less experienced in other aspects of our mission, I would advocate for an external and robust search for a Provost and VPR (when Dr. Rudolph retires) with strong faculty and campus engagement and influence in those searches.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience in teaching and research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU's Mission Statement "...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" certainly highlights teaching and research as the core of the university's mission. A fair, living wage for faculty members should be a central issue for CSU moving forward with a new president, especially if the university is to be "setting the standard" among its peers.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience as a faculty member - how will she view faculty?

Extreme business experience - will CSU be run as a business instead of an institutional education?

Part of the ""good old boys' club"" - she's entrenched in Tony Frank's leadership, and President McConnell was an exciting step away from that

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Since the launch of the search, I saw the makeup of the search committee as problematic (liberal arts was woefully represented). I also find it deeply problematic that it was a closed search.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: -Lack of academic and research background

-Brings a for-profit corporate vision to a teaching and research institution

-Big involvement in projects that delivered highly questionable results for CSU and the Fort Collins community (INTO, new stadium build)

-Doesn't mention stipends, compensation, or any of the most pressing issues at CSU according to worker in any part of her cover letter

-Most positions occupied at CSU were nominations, without an open competition process, which stinks of nepotism

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Ms. Parsons is not an academic but a lawyer and a CEO. How does this benefit an academic institution and how does it serve the university and the people here? Very little true academic leadership in CV and in experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This is a nepotistic hire. Once again, same old network of loyalists to the CSU culture cause. No sense of diversity, equity or integrity. Where is the oversight and the decision making by those in positions of power? Wow- this university doesn't deserve its R1 status.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Candidate understands the administrative structure of the university and, I assume based on long service and candidate's interest in serving, a good relationship with our Chancellor.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate apparently has no university teaching or research experience. That's a huge issue as CSU looks to revamp its salaries for teaching faculty and rethink its budget model -- this is someone who lacks "'boots on the ground'" experience in the most pressing problem areas on campus.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: See candidate weaknesses.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: familiar with CSU

law and policy background

Candidate Weaknesses: no experience with teaching or research - huge concern

Working with CSU and Tony Frank for so many years, concerns about her ability to create needed changes.

Feels like this will just be Tony Frank, with a different external imagine

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I feel like this is a vote to keep the status quo and just keep the same people in power. If she is hired, I expect no real changes in many of the areas that CSU sorely needs to change. This is a step backwards.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience with, and clear investment in, the institution

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of academic training/experience, and thereby a potential disconnect from the irreplaceable features of the institution (teaching and research)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It's alarming to me that the finalist is so thoroughly embedded in existing leadership circles. Who will really be running the University? What are the key priorities for this candidate in areas of essential interest to faculty and students, who are the real drivers of success at CSU?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: In my view, she was highly successful in her previous positions at CSU. I believe she has the experience and capability well suited to be CSU President.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think there is always a desire among the faculty to compare multiple candidates, but the sensitive matter of including candidates who are not ready to communicate their candidacy with their current employer outweighs that consideration. Fortunately, we have a broad selection committee, and I am

quite comfortable with the process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knowledge of CSU, experience working with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: no demonstrated knowledge, understanding or commitment to diversity, equity and/or inclusion; limited teaching experience; no experience leading an academic unit

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am concerned that faculty and staff have had no opportunities to engage with Ms. Parsons. I am further concerned that the appointment of Ms. Parson's is further evidence of the nepotistic behavior exhibited by the Board, the Chancellor and the current administration of CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Ms. Parson seems to have great experience with a business mindset, which might help our university balance the budget.

Candidate Weaknesses: No research and most of all, no teaching experience, so it is hard to know if she will understand the primary goals of a university: teaching!

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The whole process felt very quiet. I did participate in one of the early presentations, but not knowing the candidates, not having them go through a presentation like all TT faculty members have to do does not seem right.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU.

A close associate of Tony Frank

Candidate Weaknesses: No PhD

No previous academic experience

Her hiring contributes to the culture of nepotism at CSU promoted by Tony Frank

Does not bring new ideas. It is basically the same old stuff.

No real academic accomplishments. Buildings/stadiums do not count as academic achievements.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We need a highly respected academic leader that can bring new ideas/values/vision to CSU.

The role of the Chancellor in this process has to be minimized.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The serious lack of transparency regarding the exit of the previous president has given rise to a lack of trust in CSU leadership and the Board of Governors with regard to respect for the CSU community and adherence to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion efforts so many within CSU strive to work towards. What guarantee do we have that this president will be respected and provided the freedom to lead without being treated like a puppet or being controlled by political agenda.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business oriented.... could be a strength if it is ethical and in line with the values of our university... I doubt that very much

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience in the field of higher education. No sense of what students, faculty, staff want and need from a leader. White, upper-class woman does not represent the community that she is leading. She appears to be a puppet for Tony Frank. We need change.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We want someone who represents us ethically, morally, physically, and professionally.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Significant experience with and knowledge of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience as a faculty member, researcher, department head, dean, etc.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The optics on campus around this hire are quite bad - it appears as if the Chancellor/Board got rid of the past President (first woman President at CSU) and are now installing a hand-picked replacement who will "get in line". It feels like campus is being micro-managed at a distance by a Board and Chancellor that are out of touch with campus.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Effective legal and policy administrator at the university level. CEO business leadership skills

Candidate Weaknesses: No faculty or academic experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Whether a University President who does not have any academic or faculty experience can effectively lead or support a land-grant university and its faculty remains an open question. Are there examples of similar appointments elsewhere that have succeeded? If so, such examples could go a long way to allaying faculty concerns on this issue.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has some experience with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: She has not worked with faculty or students; she is an a business person and not an academic; she doesn't have a sense of race, immigration, gender (even tho she created the Ripple Effect, it was pretty ineffective); and she has been connected to endeavors that are not helpful to our community like the stadium and the Spur, that costs lots of money but doesn't help our move toward equity and inclusiveness.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I vote no confidence!

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: A strong administrator with a thorough knowledge of both CSU and the system. A measured approach to managing people and groups. A commitment to CSU and its land grant mission.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience working as a faculty member.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I support the selection of Amy Parsons as our next president. She has the confidence of our Chancellor, has a deep familiarity and commitment to the university's mission and its role as a land grant institution, and will be a strong leader.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Obviously accomplished, articulate, and well-connected with powerful CSU insiders.

Candidate Weaknesses: As far as I can see, little-to-no personal experience teaching, creating university-level educational experiences, dealing daily with students, garnering outside research funding, pursuing and publishing original research, or earning tenure - in other words, why universities exist.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The outcome and process are very disappointing and indicate the further corporatization of CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Academic and private sector experience

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with tenure-track

No experience conducting extramural research

Was part of a CSU leadership cohort that failed to invest adequately in systems and personnel talent surrounding HR, OSP, and BFS and now CSU is a mess as a result.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Parsons was part of a CSU leadership cohort that failed to invest adequately in systems and personnel talent surrounding HR, OSP, and BFS and now CSU is a mess as a result.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Committed to CSU

Terminal degree

Strategic Thinker

Future focused and able to help CSU navigate into the future.

Candidate Weaknesses: None at all!

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please do not mess this up. I already worry that Amy will say no based on the negative response. And then we will have a stain on the search and will be less likely to get a good next candidate. There is really no other way to conduct a search of this nature and get the best candidates. Again, please do not mess this up.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Seems to have the confidence of the Board

Candidate Weaknesses: A very poor match for the leader of the "Green University" Lack of academic faculty experience and inability to understand the goals, wants and needs of faculty.

May emphasize fiscal efficiencies over quality of teaching, research and the student experience.

May seek corporate partnerships as expedient but short-sighted and harmful way to shore up budgets

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: please recruit and consider other candidates

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She expresses commitment to CSU and has strong ties to it.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has absolutely no experience conducting research, publishing in peer-reviewed outlets, mentoring and advising graduate students, teaching undergraduate or graduate classes...etc. etc. She has a lawyer and entrepreneur paradigm and those are not congruent with a land-grant university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Intentions and expectations are absolutely no replacement for experience and understanding.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Understands how CSU works.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has never taught or done research/scholarly activity. How could they support those that do without understanding of what that entails?

They are entrenched in CSU culture-it would be better to have outside eyes.

Weak on DEI vision.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The candidate was selected behind closed doors with no transparency. This reeks of cronyism. It seems like the old boys club is going strong, and there is no space for opposition.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Strong industry and business experience.

Understands the culture of CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not an academic even though we are an academic institution.

More than one mutual colleague/collaborator of hers (while she was at CSU, but these collaborators are external to CSU) have complained of business-related fairness and judgement concerns.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This is a controversial choice due to her lack of academic experience and concerns around fairness in business.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Work History, Longstanding dedication to CSU, Alum, Business and Entrepreneurial mindset, JD, kind yet no-nonsense and straight shooting.

Candidate Weaknesses: Perhaps weak on academic experience, however, her role as President is organizational and the Provost provides the deep commitment to academic / research concerns. Having a strong business professional and a strong provost will counterbalance the two needs.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I strongly support this candidate.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am very disappointed with how this presidential search has gone down. My concerns include:

- The process is not transparent. This comes on the heels of completely opaque decisions to fire Joyce McConnell and then other upper-level administrators.
- There is a clear bias towards insiders, members of the "old boys club" of individuals personally loyal to Tony Frank.

It's really disappointing and dispiriting, to be honest.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience. No experience with teaching, research, service and engagement. I am concerned that Ms. Parsons will not understand the faculty role, responsibilities, challenges.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: There was no transparency in the search process. It is hard to believe that there were no other at least equally qualified candidates.

I think it would be better for CSU to hire an external candidate with fresh perspective and no bias.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Time spent at CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not being from an academic background gives CSU a poor image regarding the emphasis on education in this institution.

Participated in establishment of Todos Santos campus, building of the stadium on campus, both of which I do not agree with.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am shocked that this is the best candidate put forth. The lack of a solid academic background is, I believe, not the image CSU wants to give the world.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Great CSU administrative experience and understanding

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of research/teaching experience

Lack of experience leading a multi-dimensional institution

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: My main concern is that Amy Parsons was pre-ordained into the position rather than the result of a comprehensive search process. My sense is that she was chosen by the chancellor. If this turns out to be true then I think this will ultimately damage CSU's reputation.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She knows the institution from her years of experience here.

Candidate Weaknesses: Does not have a PhD or a background as an academic with research responsibilities.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is difficult to gauge how Amy will do as president when it comes to issues such as the lagging faculty compensation, but it is concerning that the gap between what faculty earn at CSU and what they earn at peer institutions grew during the years she worked at CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU and the CSU system well.

Strong track record of leadership and administration.

Candidate Weaknesses: Somewhat of an unknown quantity regarding vision and plans for CSU's future.

Unclear knowledge what their understanding of the academic, research and student affairs aspects of CSU.

What is their commitment to DEI?

The problem is we just don't know.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Keep and open mind. Someone like us may not always be the best choice.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Prior administrative experience at CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic (mostly instruction and research areas) training or experience.

May not bring anything new or innovative plans to the campus.

The search and selection process is also questionable, even with all promotion articles in Source and through email.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I support your willingness to voice the concerns for the finalist on behalf of the CSU faculty promptly.
Thanks!

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Very smart and capable.

Candidate Weaknesses: I think she was a big push for the on-campus stadium. Personally, I thought the football program should have been eliminated.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think the business experience is more important than the teaching/research experience. There have been many presidents at other universities who did not come from the ranks of the faculty and they have been fine presidents. Running CSU is a business.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Seems to care about the future of CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: The candidate cannot understand the unique challenges of being a faculty member at a large state institution, having never been one herself. By choosing a business CEO to run the University, the board is stating that we should be run like a business. However, high education is not a business. We serve our community in a way that must be measured by more than profit.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Strong CSU connection, good managerial experience, ability to get things done

Candidate Weaknesses: Not a research scientist

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The idea that a run of the mill academic is capable of running an organization with a half a billion dollar endowment is laughable. That being said, the concern that Parsons is not an academic is real, and I hope she shows an understanding of the purpose that a research university serves in society.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Age and energy. Managerial experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: Most important academic and teaching experiences are lacking. Finalist was working for long period of time under current CSU chancellor Tony Frank. This might hinder her from making independent decisions and stick to the established old system that needs to adjust to new realities.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am strongly against current finalist to be president of our university.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has worked at CSU and knows our campus and attributes/challenges.

She has knowledge and experience working on the facilities/business side of the institution. As these areas of the institution are essential in keeping the university ""going"" she brings a knowledge many academic candidates would never have.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not sure, I am on board with her selection.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Maybe we should trust the process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Loves CSU. Knows CSU as an administrator.

Candidate Weaknesses: Even before I read the article in the Coloradoan, I was concerned about Parson's lack of experience as a faculty member and the feeling that this outcome was a foregone conclusion and whether she would have enough independence from Frank.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am concerned about Parson's lack of faculty experience and her independence from Chancellor Frank.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: none that I know of

Candidate Weaknesses: None that I know of and that is the problem. What has she done; there were numerous incidents of racial bias and harassment during her previous tenure.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: What has she done; there were numerous incidents of racial bias and harassment during her previous tenure. What are her goals and agenda for the University. What makes her qualified to run this institution?

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU administration and administrators past and present.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic or research experience and perhaps close ties to the Chancellor (which is also a possible potential strength).

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Close ties to the Chancellor (which is also a possible liability but also a potential strength). These possibilities sort of cancel each other out but should be considered carefully.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Tony Frank really likes her - it's important to have support from the chancellor

Politically savvy - also quite useful

Candidate Weaknesses: zero academic experience

key role in the catastrophic creation of the Todos Santos environmental and cultural disaster

wrote a nice letter, but let it be known when she was at CSU before that she considers DEI stuff to be a waste of time

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: gads what a disaster

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Previous experience as former executive vice chancellor for the CSU System.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic (Education/Research) significant experience to guide a Land Grant University.

Transitioning from CEO of an Exclusive Online Italian Luxury Market for Beauty, Men's Grooming, and Fragrance company to President of a Land Grant University does not appear as a consistent/organic trajectory.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: fundraising

Candidate Weaknesses: lack of experience and knowledge about many of the roles and responsibilities of faculty, staff, students on campus - really concerned she is out of touch with people that comprise a campus university community

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: from a process perspective, offering one final candidate does not create an inclusive search and empower our community to have a voice in this decision

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience with CSU and being acquainted with many relevant parties inside and outside the university

Candidate Weaknesses: No background in research (e.g. doctorate in sciences)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Given the lack of academic background of the president, the choice of provost will be crucial, and should not be done by the president alone but in conjunction with the current interim president and interim provost.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Minimal relevant academic background; current position seems entirely irrelevant to academic management; minimal connection to faculty and staff; past record suggests all kinds of conflict of interest unfortunately

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The search process has not been transparent and the candidate seems poorly matched with the exception of having personal connections to Tony Frank.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: History with CSU

Leadership Experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Very little experience as a faculty member, instructor

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: As a teaching faculty member at CSU, I am concerned about Amy's potential lack of understanding of my role and may view faculty in a hierarchical manner (TTF vs NTTF) rather than in the more equitable manner our department and college have worked so hard to achieve.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I like that she says that she wants CSU to be a place where faculty and researchers thrive in their disciplines and have everything they need to succeed. Not sure how she actually plans to do that, though.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not very experienced, especially not with student facing roles. Not likely well versed in the challenges of teaching and research in today's environment.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has experience in the CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: '-No research background

-No teaching background

-Overseeing a small online personal care product store is not relevant experience to being president of CSU

This is an R1 university that should be run by someone with a background in academia and/or research. I don't think this hiring properly reflects the mission of CSU.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Long history with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No clear commitment or vision of academic priorities.

Previous contributions(stadium, spur) suggest a vision of the university that is odds with that of faculty/scholar/teachers. Does not inspire confidence in commitment to academic goals

The long history can also be a liability

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Lack of transparency in search process disturbing

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She knows CSU and many of its leaders.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has never been an academic faculty member who has to balance teaching, research, and service/outreach. This is a major concern, and it has the potential to negatively affect morale throughout the campus.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I wish there were multiple finalists, and that faculty had an opportunity to express a preference among them.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has a long history with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has never been a faculty. She may not be able to fully understand faculty concerns and perspectives. I hope she chooses a strong voice for faculty among her key direct reports.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The culture at CSU is overly adversarial. I hope she can bring us together, understanding the key roles played and our need to work together.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I do not share the concerns expressed by the faculty council regarding this candidate. In my opinion Ms. Parson's is a perfectly acceptable candidate and I believe she will be an outstanding leader of CSU. I believe the views expressed by the faculty council members regarding this are narrow minded and self-serving and I do not endorse these views.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: '- Knowledge of CSU and CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: '- Complete lack of experience regarding core aspects of the university (research and teaching)

- Overly connected to current chancellor creates room for conflicts of interest
- Experience in higher ed is ONLY at CSU, which means she will not bring fresh perspectives to address the challenges facing the institution

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She knows the university system well.

Candidate Weaknesses: She is not an academic.

She graduated from the department of politics at CSU, which may present more likelihood of applying favoritism to a particular department than someone from outside CSU.

She might be less independent in making decisions because she has a long and deep network in CSU leadership system.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: successful business experience; familiar with CSU and northern Colorado region

Candidate Weaknesses: Her ability to lead a research (R1) university without a strong academic experience/background. Her vision for higher education may be limited and it may prevent the leading of CSU to establish more prestigious research and education programs in the long term.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: I find her lack of experience in academia very troubling. The logic that she can effectively lead a university because she is a successful businessperson is one we saw disastrously reflected at the national level in recent years.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I'm failing to see how she is uniquely qualified, and suggest we go back to other candidates from the search.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business and fundraising experience; Legal experience; Prior experience at CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Minimal teaching experience; no known research experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I can see the many strengths of this candidate but I also worry about the possibility of Amy not truly understanding and supporting two of the main responsibilities of CSU faculty (research and teaching).

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I am not sure what these are.

Candidate Weaknesses: I am concerned that the proposed leader of CSU is someone who has not ever served in an academic capacity. If she has not taught courses, mentored students, written grants, etc., then how could she properly understand the needs of those employed at the university and implementing the university mission?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: legal system; administration

Candidate Weaknesses: privatization of university business; willingness to do what BOG and CSU system admin want

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: this selection seems so flawed and designed to ensure BOG and the CSU system Admin (e.g., Tony Frank) can do what they want without ensuring it is what is best for students and CSU workforce (Faculty, NTTF, etc)

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Solid management experience, knowledge of working within the CSU system.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lacking understanding and experience as an academic.

Lacking in representing diversity.

Far too entrenched in the CSU system. We need a candidate from elsewhere, a fresh and objective choice for President who will bring new ideas for growth and development.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with fundraising/economics/fiscal responsibilities of the office.

Candidate Weaknesses: Oddly non-academic to be leading an academic enterprise.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Do we not have other finalists? Seems to be a really rapid decision of a single candidate. What sort of pool of candidates was there? There's no more academic candidate to select or consider?

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: business experience, knowledge of CSU leadership/system, commitment to CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Would have liked to see a stronger emphasis on diversity, equity, and inclusion, but I do really appreciate the work that she has done to study pay equity. I would have liked to know more about how she used that information to increase pay equity.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Very familiar with CSU systems (maybe too familiar).

Candidate Weaknesses: Never had an academic position. No experience with research. No experience with teaching. Too familiar with previous CSU administration.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It would be far better to get an outside person to lead the University and bring in fresh ideas and new directions.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Female, seems good with leadership roles

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching or research background

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think there was a lack of transparency with this process. It was just suddenly announced, no listening sessions, no options, no other candidates. I don't think the process was as it should have been for such an important position.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience

Knowledge of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Tenure track Faculty complain she doesn't have research and teaching experience but that's not the only thing that matters. When faculty become administrators they don't have staff and administrative experience. She's a very qualified candidate and strongly committed to CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: -

Candidate Weaknesses: Never worked as or had a career as an academic, published research to obtain tenure or promotion or developed an identity as a scholar or teacher. This is a big weakness.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: With one candidate as a finalist you are making the choice without presenting other candidates as options. That is not good process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Loves CSU. Knows and formerly worked with Tony.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience in academia.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: From Joyce's firing to Amy's hiring, this entire process has been opaque and lacking in fairness. It is embarrassing to be part of an organization that, at the highest levels of leadership, handles transitions in this manner.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Research and teaching experience is limited.

Opportunity to bring new ideas to CSU and the system.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I would like someone representing us and having a vast experience with the CSU core areas (teaching, research, and engagement). Also, we should see more candidates to have a better point of reference.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Lobbying and be able to ignore any other issues relate to diversity and inclusion on campus.

Candidate Weaknesses: Come on, she was working here before. She didn't do anything about racism, diversity issues on campus. How is she going to do anything different?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Would be nice to have a diverse and transparency process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Already understand CSU processes, at least from an administrative level.

Candidate Weaknesses: No prior academic experience, with regards to teaching and research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: While I believe Amy Parsons may be an effective administrator, I see no evidence that she can implement or inspire any innovative change to the university.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Her familiarity with how CSU operates

Candidate Weaknesses: Does she understand the needs of faculty to be successful and help students succeed?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I realize that BOG wants to find someone to move CSU forward, but this feels very rushed to me. It would have been helpful to have information about the other finalists

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Administration knowledge

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This seems to me to be a continuation of the Tony Frank administration. And I don't know if that is a good thing or not. She was VPO in the Frank admin, then left to be the executive vice chancellor for the CSU system so she is well-versed in the CSU system. .

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Great communication skills familiar with university personable will support CSU

Will moderate the woke crowd can relate to broader audience had a vision

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Don't let a bunch of outlier faculty run the university

There would be so woke faculty that would not be happy with a Nobel peace recip

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I am not sure.

Candidate Weaknesses: The fact that I am not sure of their strengths.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This has been an alienating and disempowering process from start to finish. I am not saying I should have any say as to what happens at my place of employment, but it feels like the opposite of a transparent and fair process.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Obviously, she's close to Tony Frank.

Candidate Weaknesses: Other than the cronyism with Frank, it's unclear what experience or training she would bring to this job.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Tony Frank just can't quit CSU-Fort Collins, can he? He provided able leadership in the 2000s and 2010s, but CSU needs a different vision now.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Long association with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has no background or experience in teaching, research, or interacting with students.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is disappointing that the BOG has decided on a candidate that has little experience in academia or understanding the needs, stresses, or day to day lives of faculty.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business?

Candidate Weaknesses: ZERO teaching experience. Come on. Zero research, also not great.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: You think you aren't going to have a mass exodus of employees already with conditions, now hire someone who REALLLLLLLY doesn't seem to care about the ""workers"" or the ""little people"" on campus.....gross.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Known Amy since she was a lawyer at legendary law firm Farber Brownstein. The late Steve Farber was one of my best friends and my attorney for a bunch of stuff. He always raved about her and coming from Steve that was one amazing compliment

Candidate Weaknesses: known that I ever saw

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: She will be amazing.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows a ton about CSU with her previous roles.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This selection seems fishy. You mean to tell us that in the entire US, Amy is the only person that you all feel is competent enough to take over this role. Amazing.

Until you all run a true search, her appointment will be suspect.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think it's unfortunate that there is only one finalist so we have no points for comparison. This survey thus creates a perception that we get to provide input but it is clear that the decision has been made and that our opinions are not respected, nor valued. Please do better.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience in core mission of university (teaching, research).
Seeming lack of knowledge of and/or interest in faculty.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: After seeing how badly similar non-transparent administrative hiring processes have worked out at Boulder it is really upsetting to see CSU using them.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We still have no idea why our last president was relieved of their duties. Without that information, it's impossible to know what we should look for in our next president. This is a public university and it needs to start making its reasoning, decisions, and process public.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: experience in managing corporations

Candidate Weaknesses: no academic profession experience
no teaching / research experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think this move towards having one person candidate is a wrong move, especially when the person is not qualified in working in academic setting in that high a position!

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She was a groomed choice by the board.

Candidate Weaknesses: She has no university experience beyond CSU. She has no teaching experience. She was hand picked by the board rather than truly searching for a candidate with a broad scope of experiences and POVs of how other universities are run.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Has experience and knowledge of CSU system. Previous experience with large infrastructure projects at CSU. Clear loyalty to the CSU System and current leadership.

Candidate Weaknesses: No demonstrated experience with research or teaching. Excessive loyalty to CSU System and current leadership.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Highly accomplished, appears to be highly motivated.

Candidate Weaknesses: None perceived.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: While there is much whining about a "lack of academic background. I think this candidate is exceptionally well qualified for and will have a staff steeped in academic issues. She should be hired!!

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It's hard to know if this was a good choice or not since the whole process was kept hidden from the university community. Instead of having to spend money on marketing around how good the process was, a transparent process would have been much more reassuring.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Commitment to CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience teaching or doing research, no interactions with students

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This was not a national search, clearly. It's obvious that the only candidates considered were internal people, or people with long ties to Tony Frank. I'm disappointed.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Proven professional, a CSU alum and daughter as a student.

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching. No research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Where is the transparency? Who were the other finalists? Why is this a secret? I thought we were a public institution. Why weren't your constituents part of the process?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: none

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic credentials! Very weak track-record to be President of an R1 university. Horrible track record at CSU with people who have worked with her or under her. Terrible supervisor.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This candidate is unacceptable to be President of CSU!

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: While I am sure that the candidate is a well-qualified administrator, I am disappointed that we are not seriously considering bringing in a new voice and new energy into the CSU system and our CSU Fort Collins campus. That feels like a loss.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: CSU experience

Legal background

Construction/project management

Candidate Weaknesses: Academic experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Absolutely disgusting that no candidate was made available to meet with the campus. Asking campus in put on what questions to ask the candidates was a sham.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience at CSU in a variety of leadership roles.

Candidate Weaknesses: No research experience (i.e., applying for grants, conducting research, publishing, presenting at conferences, etc.).

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think Amy Parsons is a solid candidate for the President role.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business background

Law background

Not faculty, no association with tenure

Clear leadership skills

Notable successes in business

Strong-willed, passionate, comes from the Ram family

Candidate Weaknesses: N/A

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I hope she disrupts the entire establishment.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knows CSU budget and operations

Will articulate the strengths of CSU academic research and teaching
can communicate well with BOG and legislature

Candidate Weaknesses: has to have a strong provost and EVp

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: a high ranking voice for CSU faculty and staff

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I like the fact that she has a diverse background. The significant diversity of leadership roles should be a plus.

Candidate Weaknesses: She will need to overcome the appearance that she has less experience in the Higher Education academic setting.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Connection to CSU with enough outside experience to bring a fresh perspective?

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of an academic background. Does the candidate have a thorough understanding of the unique challenges that come with running a University?

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Strong relationship with CSU, demonstrated commitment to CSU, backing of key stakeholders, reputation for seeing through projects.

Candidate Weaknesses: None

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This president needs the support from our community that the last one did not receive.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Lots of experience with the business side of CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with the academic side of CSU. Will be perceived as only doing what the chancellor wishes, and thus will not address long-standing equity issues on campus

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Intimate knowledge of the CSU system

Candidate Weaknesses: She is not qualified to have a faculty appointment in any academic department here. No experience in teaching or research, which are 2 of the cornerstones of the academic mission.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Born in Colorado, where she participated in 4-H She also served in the ASCSU student government and as a tour guide for Admissions, along with being selected to serve as a White House intern in Washington, D.C.

Candidate Weaknesses: N/A

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Buddy of Tony Frank

Will be Tony's yes-person

No teaching experience

No research experience

No history as a faculty member anywhere

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: A major problem at CSU is the in-breeding. Seems it just goes on and on.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Very familiar with CSU. Presumably has good working relationships already with key players.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not an academic; No research or teaching experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I'm overall supportive of Amy Parsons as the next CSU president.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: She doesn't have any experience as a faculty member or any leadership experience guiding/interacting with faculty.

I see her as an industry liaison but with out much substance regarding the land grant mission.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Highly competent and successful in all her endeavors. Knows CSU (pros and cons). Has good relationship with Chancellor Frank. And she is a woman and I would like to see a woman succeed in this position.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Charming personality.

Candidate Weaknesses: Academic, teaching and research experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This is an academic institution with a full range of disciplines. We deserve leaders who have understand the needs and work of academicians.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Never held a faculty position.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Never held a faculty position and only real academic experience was helping CSU build new expensive expansions while faculty compensation has been held stagnant for years.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Very capable and good knowledge of CSU Operations

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic background

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The lack of academic background suggests that Amy's hiring should be coupled with with a really strong Provost going forward.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Runs an online company

Candidate Weaknesses: zero experience in managing people in higher ed.

Does not have an advanced degree.

Has no idea what faculty are actually required to do here.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Tony Frank minion, no thanks.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: CSU Knowledge - system, administration and investment

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience, no mention of faculty made in her application. No mention of HSI status. No idea of commitment to DEIJ.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not have any personal experience in faculty affairs and research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Looks like you are hiring her to run this university like a business and not an academic institution.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of the working of the university

Candidate Weaknesses: Unclear that she grasps the major foci of the university. Lack of faculty experience (research or teaching - in any meaningful way).

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Is a woman

Candidate Weaknesses: Has never taught or conducted research as a faculty member of a university.

Only has university experience at CSU.

No background in student success or DEISJ work

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: not sure who this candidate is

Candidate Weaknesses: not sure who this candidate is

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: it seems that everything was a secret, then just made the announcement, not sure what this survey can be used for?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: If you had three finalists, let us know who those three finalists are. True transparency is letting us know who the finalists were and why Parsons is the best of the group.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of CSU Administration

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience as an academic

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Strong suspicion that this is an inside job orchestrated by Chancellor Frank himself, and facilitated by the BOG.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Seasoned Higher Ed Administrator that knows how to get things done.

Candidate Weaknesses: Every candidate has weaknesses. If given the chance, she can hire around her to support her weak spots.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: University operations and infrastructure improvement.

Candidate Weaknesses: I did not see evidences of the candidate or her vision in leading CSU building strong academic and research programs.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic background, so proper provost pick will be incredibly important. There is also fear of nepotism and Amy being a "puppet" of the chancellor.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She isn't Woke.

Candidate Weaknesses: She won't listen to your BS.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Grow up. Stop complaining about every decision being made that you aren't consulted and just do your work.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Business experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Business experience;

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I do not have confidence that the candidate has adequate higher education experience to lead an R1 institution.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: knows a lot about CSU including the workings of the upper administration

Candidate Weaknesses: no academic history
every job at CSU was due to an appointment by Dr Frank

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: None

Candidate Weaknesses: Sneaky, opaque, lapdog to the status quo.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Unsurprisingly you got rid of a good president without consultation and put up a company woman.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am neutral as to the final candidate, but trust the process to have been fair and equitable, and am ready to support the new president.

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: No education or research background; the SPUR and Stadium are both projects with dubious missions and direction; weak in DEI track record

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: She has Tony Frank on speed dial, I am sure.

Candidate Weaknesses: No academic experience.

Will do what Tony Frank tells her to do.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Vote of "no confidence."

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Unfamiliar with faculty side of University work

Not involved in academic research

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Why were other finalists not named?

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Probably good at fundraising, business connections, BoG connections.

Candidate Weaknesses: Insufficient academic experience, which is a MAJOR weakness.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching/research background.

Is a business leader-I don't think the university should be led like a business.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU; Executive experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Seems to lack faculty awareness. I'm not sure she'll be a champion for faculty.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty Miembro de la facultad docente

Candidate Strengths: Excelente y exitosa

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: For a national search to come to a sole finalist that was a protege of the Chancellor just seems to stretch credulity.

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This news caught many of us by surprise. It seems making decisions behind closed doors is a common theme at CSU!

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: How can you make any comments about strengths and weaknesses without seeing an interview or any type of q&a?

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experienced, committed, great ambassador, understands the university

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think she is an outstanding choice

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: No obvious strengths for this position.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with teaching, mentoring students or research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: History at CSU, successful entrepreneur

Candidate Weaknesses: Tony Frank's mistress, obvious nepotism

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Get real

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience at CSU as a student and in the leadership

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of experience in teaching

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Appears to be the ideal mix of background with and connection to CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: None noted.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience as a faculty member -- no experience as a teacher or researcher.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of the CSU system.

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of understanding of teaching and research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Experience in multiple positions at CSU. Experience outside of education.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Lack of university background and understanding of the academic mission.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I can't really make this judgement without seeing their CV/resume.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Past experience with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Limited teaching experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Skilled, perfect for the job!

Candidate Weaknesses: None

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Support Amy!

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: NO research background

No teaching background

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths: Knows CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Insider, Lawyer, "safe choice"

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: Faculty

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: No teaching background.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Recently retired state classified (4 decades)

Candidate Strengths: Female

Former legal counsel for CSU

Former CSU administrator

Some familiarity with local community

Entrepreneurial

Candidate Weaknesses: She does not stand out for taking a stance on social issues of significance; diversity, equity, fairness, justice or inclusion. In fact she has had positions of power & privilege at CSU and seems to have gone with the “flow” thereby seemingly benefiting the status quo vs creating or advocating for transformative change, sometimes to the detriment of the institution and its community, as in the criminal & ethical debacle at CSUPD involving the disgraceful Chief Yarborough.

She appeared to remain silent on the matter while her peers; Lawrence Pendleton, Judy Schmidt and another gracious female attorney, whose name eludes me, all opposed Yarborough’s conduct by their words & actions. They tried to support staff and keep the university from more liability and in the end, they paid a price for their integrity and had to move on to other locations.

However, Amy Parsons appears to have been rewarded for her silence and preserving the status quo and got promoted!

Meanwhile, thanks to the tenacity of others, including some honest but persecuted police officers, outside attorneys, the federal investigator and the valiant MEDIA-the truth prevailed and Yarborough was exposed & left in disgrace. This serves as an example of protecting an authority/administrator in order to preserve the status quo despite the fact that this is a source of great liability to the institution! We cannot ignore, afford nor reward this kind of behavior. You should not have to be “forced” to do the right thing but rather integrity should prevail!

It is easy to maintain the appearance of doing the right thing when you are not faced with adversity- it is adversity which reveals your true character!

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please see above comment. Thank you for this opportunity and validating what we all know to be true reference the reality of retaliation and the maintenance of the status quo to benefit those in positions of power & privilege along with the disconnect that exists between alleged leadership and those who are on the front lines of the institution creating the CSU experience for our community from the custodians, maintenance, students, professors, researchers & administrators. I applaud your taking action to allow the staff this platform of safety and anonymity.

The challenge is now in the hands of those who are going to “anoint” the chosen one. Will they listen to the voices of the many or heed the select voices of the few to the detriment of us all and making this yet another historical example of a futile process. The irony of it all is if we

choose not to take action and use our voices to affect our CSU experience then we engage in our own oppression and dismissal!

CSU is a great institution capable of forging a new path where others have not yet dared to go which can open portals to amazing opportunities & potential for humanity! Let us dare to be great! Thank you!

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): I am both an APP and a graduate student on campus

Candidate Strengths: Amy Parsons has such a breadth and depth of experiences both related specifically to higher education and CSU, but also more broadly in corporate settings. She is an excellent communicator, she is brilliant in front of crowds, and has a clear strength in building relationships and partnerships.

Candidate Weaknesses: As with every candidate, there will be pieces of specific experience that are missing. I have no doubt that her strengths in coalition building will guide her through those gaps.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: As a non-faculty contributing member of this community, I am deeply concerned that Faculty Council appears to have forgotten that faculty are not the only member's of this community. Faculty are an incredibly important part of the University, and this place is also made up of people that bring students in, people that house students, people that advise and support students, people that clean up after students, and people that keep everything running behind the scenes. We should be, first and foremost, a student centered place. It seems like Amy has a lens and the experience to do this, and focussing so narrowly on her lack of *specifically* a research faculty experience (though she did teach in SAHE-- which seems to be overlooked) is missing the larger picture.

Frankly, I am disappointed in Faculty Council. Many of your remarks are clearly rooted in sexism, and it makes me worried about how you teach your classes.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Department Head

Candidate Strengths: Knows the campus and culture at CSU in a comprehensive way as a function of her previous roles here. Knows how to get big, visionary complex things done (e.g. SPUR, Todos Santos). Has political savvy and will likely work effectively with the Chancellor and Board of Governors. Cares about CSU in a deep way.

Candidate Weaknesses: Has not come up through the faculty ranks in the traditional way and does not have first hand experience with tenure, promotion, academic research.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy's strengths greatly exceed her weaknesses. Her knowledge of the campus and where we are excelling and where we are not will allow her to be far more effective in her first two years, especially with respect to infrastructure lever that are holding us back and desperately need to be addressed - Human Resources and Sponsored programs to name just two. Amy is politically savvy and will be a strong and effective advocate for funding and garnering political support for big visionary ideas. Amy's priorities and vision are aligned with those of the CSU Chancellor and therefore will likely be received well by the BOG. Attention to the usual rumors that accompany any woman ascending to a position of power should be ignored or better, repudiated as the hearsay they are.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Graduate Teaching Instructor

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: '- Lack of academic background

- Not even mentioning compensation and stipends struggles at CSU in her cover letter (but somehow Tony Frank was mentioned 6 times)
- Corporate vision to a learning and researching institution
- Great involvement with projects highly questionable in terms of net benefits for CSU and the Fort Collins community (INTO project, new stadium building)
- Lack of competition for all high position she ever occupied at CSU (straight up nomination, which stinks of nepotism)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This nomination is a direct insult for everyone who teaches and researches in this University. It is a shock that during the largest strike of higher education in the history of this country, CSU learns nothing and refuses to prioritize campus workers, nominating a corporation for-profit expert instead of someone experienced with the current struggles that characterize labs and classrooms nationwide. CSU took a huge step in the wrong direction. I was never so embarrassed of being a ram.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Graduate Assistant

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Involvement in Todos Santos, here are a series of links to help inform you on the controversy:

<https://theecologist.org/2015/nov/02/colorado-state-campus-mega-development-steals-mexican-beach-you-call-mindful>

<https://collegian.com/articles/opinion/2016/01/our-view-csus-role-in-todos-santos-reduces-credibility-of-the-university/>

https://csusystem.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2020/06/2016_02_09_21_50_56_February-2016-Public-Comment-Handouts.pdf

http://firstrunfeatures.com/presskits/patrimonio/patrimonio_study_guide_english.pdf

(specifically page 20-21)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I realize that Todos Santos is something that the entire system is involved with, and that the blame is not entirely on Amy Parsons. However, reconciliation must begin and Amy Parsons presidency will surely do quite the opposite. Consider your role in the work of reparations/reconciliation with Todos Santos and the community there.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Staff

Candidate Strengths: Background in Business, History of CSU employment, Connected to Community

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience teaching at a University level. No experience as a researcher at a University level. No demonstration of a commitment to teachers/professors/students

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: While I understand the President of CSU is primarily a business leader, running a very large institution I think any candidate should have significant experience working with professors and teachers as well as researchers. As a business CSU primarily generates revenue through student tuition and through research grants. Any president should understand that these are of utmost importance and should have some background in these areas or more specifically a history of success supporting teaching and research efforts. I do not believe the Amy Parsons has this experience and because of this I do not believe she is an ideal candidate to lead CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Graduate Teaching Assistant

Candidate Strengths: Experience of being a vice-chancellor in the CSU system, industry connection

Candidate Weaknesses: No PhD, no significant experience of teaching and research, no involvement with an academic institution in the recent years (as a faculty or researcher), no post-doc or graduate student life experiences.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU is an esteemed institution and a land-grant university. The president of this institution should be a face that resembles someone with a robust academic experience. The Board of Governors should nominate a candidate who can understand the integrity of research and teaching in an university, and who has a vast experience of teaching and research along with leadership skills to lead an institution.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Current Admin Pro; Transitioning to Faculty

Candidate Strengths: I think it's wonderful that she is from CSU in her earlier career. Talk about a great asset and background story! Her career as an entrepreneur will also be an asset to our university as we navigate operations in the coming years, which are likely to include much more private-public sector partnership.

Candidate Weaknesses: Amy Parsons may not have much of an agricultural background, so this will be a critical component of developing her positions, policies and relationships. We encourage her and welcome her to the Western Colorado Campus when her schedule permits!

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Thank you for all your work to select such an exciting candidate!

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): endowed chair

Candidate Strengths: familiarity with system, interests in DEI, legal background, connected to Front Range and may understand our national, international roles

Candidate Weaknesses: no experience with instruction, land grant institutions or apparently teaching and research (in other words, expectations of faculty)

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: familiarity with system, interests in DEI, legal background, connected to Front Range and may understand our national, international roles

no experience with instruction, land grant institutions or apparently teaching and research (in other words, expectations of faculty)

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): GTA

Candidate Strengths: Many years of experience working for CSU, but this should not be the most valuable quality when choosing a candidate.

Candidate Weaknesses: Seems to be friends with the Chancellor, a nepotism pick.

Most recent experience puts her out of touch with academics.

No appropriate background in teaching, academics, research, or any skill that would make her an appropriate choice for President of a University.

Overall underqualified.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: There has to be another more qualified individual, whose resume is better suited, and is not the "who you know" choice.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Research assistant

Candidate Strengths: She seems well connected.

Candidate Weaknesses: I am concerned she will not put the well-being of students first. Additionally, I am concerned that research and education will not take priority when making financial decisions.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We need a president who puts the heart of the campus first- students. Ensuring that their educational experience is the best it can be. So that means focusing on improving their spaces, such as tearing down and rebuilding facilities that are currently falling apart.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain)

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: no experience in research or teaching in higher education; this results in less understanding of how research and teaching faculties work, what they need, and how their role impact students; less understandings of how graduate students and the graduate school impact undergraduate students, faculty research, etc; in a way, too removed from what most people on campus have experienced

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: please reconsider having other finalists

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain):

Candidate Strengths: She understands the importance of taking care of employees to retain and build a great environment to work at ,which we have been lacking in for years.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I wrote you folks a letter a while back titled (urgent we need help) I believe you listened to us and I would like to thank you. Amy is a great Candidate and I believe she would be amazing for CSU.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain) AP Research

Candidate Strengths: Has worked at CSU in the past.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience with teaching or research. This is a major drawback.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The candidate appears to have been secretly selected with the aim for fundraising, and with little insights, experience, or consideration for how CSU faculty and administrative professionals support the CSU's educational and research missions.

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Extension

Candidate Strengths: '- Knows CSU-Fort Collins and CSU Systems

- Experienced leader
- Passionate about moving CSU forward

Candidate Weaknesses: Don't know of any

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Please make Amy an offer she can't refuse so that she can join CSU as soon as possible!

"

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Graduate Student Researcher

Candidate Strengths: She is from Colorado.

Candidate Weaknesses: She is not from academia.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: You should find someone from academia. A lawyer/makeup company CEO is not the right choice to be the president of a university.

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Student

Candidate Strengths: Looks very professional

Candidate Weaknesses: Can't think of any

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: CSU is the best university in the world so the president of CSU should work hard to make CSU Number 1 in the world.

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Graduate Teaching Assistant

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Little to no academic teaching or research experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: Other (explain)

Candidate Strengths: A

Candidate Weaknesses: A

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: A

Employee Classification: Other (explain): Grad Student

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Amy has an incredibly impressive resume/CV that includes both work in academia and in the private sector. It will be nice to have a person in the presidential role with both of these qualities, an ability to make a decision without 50 different committees, and the drive to get things done and accomplished. It's also a positive that she has a JD, has worked in OGC, and has a detailed knowledge of CSU policies and issues with free speech, etc. in general.

Candidate Weaknesses: From the information we've been given, I don't have anything specific.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I know there are incredibly strong feelings of displeasure in Amy's appointment, by faculty (in general), and this seems to stem from 2 central issues. 1. Amy was at the university previously and there seems to be some bad blood, it's unclear what that is specifically but from conversations it seems to revolve around personality as opposed to her ability to do her job. 2. She didn't rise through the faculty ranks and doesn't have a PhD. Faculty hate anyone in administration that wasn't at one point a faculty member. Quite frankly faculty would hate anyone that is put in this position. The complaint that she isn't academia focused is ridiculous on its face given that she has taught, been at the university for more than a decade, and law school still counts as academia. What faculty are actually mad about is someone coming in and not babying them, telling them they have to meet actual deadlines, and not centering the entire universe around their specific needs. Other people work here. I've seen extremely unprofessional behavior from faculty and faculty representatives since the announcement, in both comments and actions. People should be given the chance to come in and make changes within the university, pending a Title IX complaint or similar, it is my hope that the Board will continue with this appointment. It is a positive that she brings so much business experience to the role, regardless of feelings on the matter, the university is a business and should be run as one. I think, too, the Board and others should consider the gendered component of their complaints and reflect on whether a man with a similar personality and resume would be getting this level of push back.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: A long connection the University from being an undergraduate, a student worker and a lengthily professional career in legal and administrative matters within the system. Knowledge of key power brokers inside and outside the university. A deep desire to see the university succeed and practical experience in helping the university to grow into the institution that it is today through capital projects worked on.

Candidate Weaknesses: Perceived bias that certain things that will benefit the university are motivated more out of her daughter attending the university rather than for the good of the university itself.

A "'safe'" choice given the legitimate criticism that this is more of an internal hire given the candidate's close association with the university for 16 years prior to 2020.

Valid critique that the candidate may not be able to bring new ideas to the university based off of previous history.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It would have been nice for the Board of Governors to have considered at least two finalist candidates, with one being a bit more removed from the University than the finalist candidate that has been chosen.

While there are some valid and perceived concerns about this hire, there are those concerns about any candidate who has a close association with a former employer. At this time, the university needs a steady hand to lead it through the end of the pandemic period we are in and envision a better work and learning environments for all on campus. I hope that the new President will take time to address the concerns raised by the faculty council, cementing a plan to work with them to find common solutions.

It would be great to have the new President do a listening tour for each of the colleges, specifically to hear the concerns of GTA/GRA students and administrative/departmental staff who are an important strategic pillar of making the university run effectively and efficiently. Meeting with and giving the resources to the Facilities Management team is essential as well, given the personnel shortages of trained individuals who are often unsung heroes that make so many things possible at this institution.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: '- experience with CSU Operations and the higher education system from a legal and business perspective

- institutional knowledge
- enthusiasm for the position
- verbalized willingness to move strategic plans forward (a major concern I had was that all of the work folks across the university put into the strategic plan would be axed with new leadership... a worry that is, frankly, still alive and well)

Candidate Weaknesses: I'll add my voice to the concerns Faculty Council has raised already. Hiring a CSU President who is basically an internal hire, who doesn't appear likely to challenge the institution or drive initiatives around inclusion and access forward, doesn't feel as though we're moving in a promising direction.

I'm less concerned about Ms. Parson's lack of direct experience in teaching and research than I am about the lack of voiced commitment to teaching and research. I don't doubt that she would be an effective leader--of CSU as a *business* and primarily from that perspective. That is concerning.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: To be honest, despite the concerns I mentioned, this particular hiring choice doesn't bother me overmuch, but it's because I'm losing faith in how impactful one president can be. Most bothersome about the leadership changes over the past few years is the feeling that the president matters far less than the influence of the Board of Governors. It doesn't sit right with me that faculty and staff are asked time and again to provide time, labor, input, and feedback on these hiring decisions and then to feel as though it won't matter because the Board of Governors is pulling all of the strings.

I have no doubt that Amy Parsons is a successful and highly qualified executive, and I wish her well. But my own overwhelming reaction to this hiring process was that our Chancellor and Board of Governors wanted someone they could put in their pocket rather than someone who would move the university forward with positive change.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Her long history with CSU means she is very familiar with the university. I like that she also has experience working at different levels within it. If it's true that she cares about every level of operations and is highly concerned with employee retention as she says, that would be a major strength. I appreciate that she seems to value inclusivity, diversity, and equality.

Candidate Weaknesses: I don't understand how running a private business for two years is a strength as some have said. I wouldn't necessarily consider it a weakness, but I don't find it reassuring, especially when the company is so small and new that there isn't really any information on how it is to work there, which would be my main concern. Additionally, I really want to see more specifically about concrete things she did while at CSU, as most that has been shared has been very vague.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: My main hope for the new president is that retention starts being taken seriously. Wages and salaries for many employees are embarrassingly low and making it difficult for many to cover living expenses and to stay in the area. I would love to continue working for CSU, but the horribly low pay and poor health insurance options are proving to make it a challenge.

Additionally, as far as other fiscal issues are concerned, many areas of campus seem to require serious repairs. The ceiling in my workspace collapsed this year due to excessive leaking, and we were told to suck it up because there's no money to fix the building's roof, and that many other buildings need new roofs and are a higher priority than us. I'd really like to feel the safety of my workspace be taken seriously.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: The job of President is mostly PR and administrative. She has both.

She is probably smart given the law experience and other education.

She has kids attending CSU so she understands our customer base.

I really like that she used to work in operations at Lori- since I also work in operations.

Candidate Weaknesses: She was not faculty- but that is what a Provost is for.

My biggest concern is she is probably Tony Frank's crony.

Tony was a great President, but he had an over focus on pet projects. I think the stad

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: My biggest concern is she is probably Tony Frank's crony- which has good and bad sides.

Tony was a great President, but he had an over focus on pet projects. I think all the new buildings were smart. The stadium was fine, but Todos Santos is dumb. Pet projects ultimately take funds away from marketing.

Spur is dumb- because it is SO expensive... and will be year after year.

SPUR is taking away from operating budgets (no matter what they say). We need to prepare for enrollment cliff of 2025 and Tony's other crony Rick M. is considering pulling back funds from the MarCom (marketing).

If Parson's follows Tony's direction in marketing it will be real bad for CSU. However, she did work in private industry so maybe she will see the value.

One does NOT need faculty experience to run a university. For example, Ajay Menon came into the College of Ag with no Ag experience and did a great job rebranding the college.

Parson's will have a Provost to handle faculty. Faculty will grumble (about anyone you pick) but they will be fine.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: '- She has worked at CSU before

- She has seen and know what works and what doesn't when it comes to having a successful campus and community
- Her long career history and love for CSU makes her a great candidate. Her previous positions have given her great experience and knowledge on how to run/operate a major university

Candidate Weaknesses: None!

She has been a part of the CSU community for a long time and has shown great care for the campus community her entire career at CSU.

- She doesn't need teaching experience to be a great president at CSU

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I have been an employee for years and was around when Amy was involved with campus Operations, as well as when she was the Executive Vice Chancellor. She has always had a heart for CSU and has had a huge impact on many different systems around campus. She always took responsibility to make the proper adjustments to have smooth running campus. I am very thankful she is the finalist for the position.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: familiarity with the CSU system legal side

Policies and procedures

Candidate Weaknesses: Just looks bad as usual that Tony and the Chancellors office is just hiring another familiar face that will just promote their wishes and not what will be in the best interests of the campus as a whole. (stadium on campus that negative effects all of campus life just for the vanity of athletics?) Possible non support of the underpaid and overworked state classified union on campus.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Why were there so many people tied to the chancellors office on the search board? If they have the final vote then they should have recused themselves from this committee. I also noticed that no one from the union was involved in the search committee. We already know that Dr Frank is anti union will Mrs Parson continue this view of our union as illegitimate or will she embrace us and be willing to work with us since the CPC hasn't done much for us since i got here in "'13'".

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It is highly concerning that this individual does not have a stronger background in teaching or research. These are the pillars of our university and a 'business' background should not supersede the knowledge and understanding earned by having experience in these areas. In reading through available interviews and other materials that CSU provided staff in order to familiarize the CSU community with this candidate, there is little to no mention of embracing, advocating for, and protecting our LGBTQ+ community members. Given current global crisis and political climate, to overlook and not even comment on how she will represent these individuals and other minority groups is unacceptable in this role as well as society as a whole. I do not believe that Ms. Parsons is the correct candidate to lead CSU in any capacity.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Strong Leader while at CSU, Amy was the only VP during my 25 + career years that has made the effort to get out and meet the entire department that she was in charge of.

Is very familiar with the CSU system and knows how to lead and raise money for the university.

Candidate Weaknesses: Looks like having a law degree could be viewed at as a weakness. Seems like a lot of upper management positions that have been hired over the last couple of years have law degrees and this might not be the best fit for these positions at the university.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Faculty council- How many individuals did you have on the 31 person hiring committee, did you not give what you thought were the best candidates to the board of Governors? If Amy Parsons was one of them, then why are you sending out this survey and have a problem with her hire?

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Lots of leadership experience.

Candidate Weaknesses: Not a ton of educational background.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: We've got an employment issue at CSU amongst all ranks of workers. Does Amy really have the on-the-ground experience to handle these issues? Strategic planning is great. Now what about making people want to work here again. It needs to be more than extra days off. Does she have experience with this or are we hiring a corporate "get it done" attitude that will ignore lower levels and take control without input from the people who make the campus run? Or even care about someone making 1/10th her salary or less. Nobody yet has really understood issues amongst lower income employees because they have forgotten what it's like to have to decide on if they can afford the name brand toothpaste this month.

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: She is a lawyer and comes from a background that includes CSU and private work.

Candidate Weaknesses: She is perceived as non-academic. Also her independent business is seen as high-end catering to an elite clientele, and her status as a lawyer, makes her seem out of touch with boots on the ground reality.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I know the biggest concern from Faculty Council is her lack of academic qualifications. However, many of us on the "bottom" that support you see it as a plus because, let us be honest, we see YOU as out of touch with reality and self centered. Maybe her lawyer toughness and independent business entrepreneur experience can bridge the gap between reality and faculty. Sorry, but being abused by faculty and being called names because we can't bend the world to your will is getting old.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Lawyer and Administrative.

Candidate Weaknesses: No input for community. Do not know Equity and Diversity experience. What is her diversity back ground. No educational experience seems to be a political appt. for Tony Frank.

Why no other candidates. Not part of a University community currently.

Not flexible from personal experience as head of operations.

Does not seem to be an advocate for Employees.

In a University community there has to be a grey area for students and exceptions have to be made due to extenuating circumstances. Budget money seems to be priority. We need someone to show justness and fairness to our community as everyone has to do double duty due to the many people the have left our community in all jobs.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Same as above.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Colorado resident, CSU alumnus, knows our culture, previous successes as a CSU employee, strong business background, knowledge of council she'll be working with. All of this is more important than having a PhD or being a previous faculty. We all have different paths in life, and most faculty are poor administrators...thus, this candidates strength.

Candidate Weaknesses: She will really need to spend time earning faculty trust and show them that she has them, students and CSU in her top interests while working within a very tight budget that needs to be stayed within... This will be very challenging.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: She will be a good hire, and if given the chance, will be just what CSU needs and will bring our university out of the mud of the last 3 years.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: when the finalist is announced, there should be excitement and enthusiasm. I've seen none of that from anyone - all I've seen is shock, dismay, disappointment, outrage, disbelief, anger, frustration, etc. The job of being the President of CSU must be very difficult - I don't think it's a good idea to have a new President start who's ALREADY behind the curve on Day 1.

the other big problem is Amy doesn't have an academic background. Yes, she's taught a few SAHE classes, but never been a faculty member, never been a department head, never been a Dean. She is not prepared to deal with the 100% priority of CSU - education and knowledge.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: She's worked at CSU before and is a CSU grad and parent

Candidate Weaknesses: She is neither qualified academically or experientially. It is clear to faculty, staff, students, and community members that her friends in high places are the only reason she's a finalist for the position, and by awarding her the most forward-facing position at the University, CSU is damaging it's respectability and public image.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Thank you for surveying CSU faculty and staff on this important decision. However, it would have been more ideal to survey us before the press release. We won't be surprised if our feedback doesn't make a dent in the decision.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Strong operations background with experience in financial roles related to both operations and staffing.

Experience within the CSU System with existing knowledge and awareness of the issues the university faces regarding staffing, operating costs, budgeting, day-to-day operations, and past struggles.

Experience as an instructor, giving her knowledge of the faculty side of the campus and an understanding of what those roles entail.

Candidate Weaknesses: Direct research-related experience.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I do not have any reservations about this choice for the next University President.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: I don't know Amys strengths but being a current CSU employee is a plus. Amy has a vested interest in CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: If Amy were an outside candidate, I feel that would have been the weakness. Hiring Joyce was a big mistake which I hope we learn from the experience and expense it cost the University.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am sorry that the faculty council feels Amy not having teaching experience is a weakness. I think the legal experience she brings will make up for this shortfall. If she is not expected to teach, I really do not see the issue.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: per Kim Jordan's statement: "(she) held a series of critically important roles at CSU, as deputy general counsel, vice president, and executive vice chancellor – she also taught courses in the SAHE program. In other words, she understands the budgets, the legal landscape, the importance of academics, and the role of the university in the state, the System, and in students' lives. She's also demonstrated that she doesn't shy away from even the most daunting challenges.**Candidate Weaknesses:** Chief concern: lack of faculty experience

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Familiarity with CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: More professional relationships and knowledge of athletics vs. academics. Has no experience or evidence of promoting diversity or inclusion.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: To all appearances, CSU excluded someone who cared about ethics in athletics and diversity and is replacing her with someone who will toe the company line and reinforce Tony Frank's agenda over the well-being of the community. It is disheartening to see progress not only stymied, but soundly rejected and the status quo being so firmly put in place.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Has been part of the CSU system and also has had business experience in the private sector. She is from an agricultural background including 4-H and has resided in both CO and WY making her aware of the unique cultural needs of this area and what being a land grant university encompasses for this area.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I am very happy to see a woman being put forward for this position and one that has previously worked to identify areas of inequality that need to be addressed at this university.

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Law background, knowledge of CSU

Candidate Weaknesses: Concerning that no real background in the educational field such as research. Why did she leave CSU in 2020 which the same year COVID hit, and CSU went through some of its toughest times.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Seems like the candidate may have left the university during some its toughest time (COVID,2020). Having a history hear is she willing to change or continue on the path that has hindered us in certain areas.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Business experience, management experience, law, knows CSU and has worked at CSU before.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: In many different industries, experience outside the the current culture, such as education and other then being a teacher is considered an asset. Faculty needs to think outside their environment and consider diversity for the presidents position. The experience Amy Parsons brings as a CSU President would benefit the university.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Amy's extensive knowledge of the University positions her to hit the ground running. Additionally, Amy has served in roles that have exposed her to the many challenges faced related to deferred maintenance, staffing shortages, etc. through her role as the VPUO. My interactions with Amy have always been positive. Amy is approachable to all levels of the University, from front-line staff to Administration level.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Is familiar with CSU; however, not the administrative side.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Speaking from experience, when she was legal counsel, she was very hard to contact and not very responsive. My concern is that as President, she will not be accessible or available to faculty/staff, or any employee. Will she have an open door policy? Or much like a former president who built a fortress around him and nobody ever saw.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Upbeat personality, can-do collaborative attitude. Excels at identifying underutilized talent and putting them in a position to grow and better serve students or staff and thus the university.

Very familiar with CSU, CSU System and faculty, staff and operations. Well respected and can hit the ground running. A known quantity.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Extremely excited that she has been hired in this new role!

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Knowledgeable of and history with CSU. Diverse professional background. Spent time in Wyoming.

Candidate Weaknesses: None known.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This change of leadership is always time consuming and puts a lot of things on hold. Be nice to know if she was going to be around for more than 2-3 years. Probably not something that anyone can guarantee, but at least she knows the area and seems happy enough with it.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Prior leadership roles and her association with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: No experience as a full time faculty member or researcher.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Amy is a great candidate for someone strictly within an administrative role, but I feel the this role requires more. CSU's next leader should also have a strong background in academics and student engagement.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Extensive experience at CSU as attorney.

Candidate Weaknesses: None for my department.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: The complaints being put forward by faculty should have been addressed during the search and interviews. I believe that her skills would include the ability to understand complexities of teaching, research and grants.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Familiar with CSU, knowledgeable

Candidate Weaknesses: May not be able to separate from previous relationships/systems enough to always keep CSU's best interests in mind

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: It would be nice if the employees at CSU had more input or participation in the process of selecting candidates and eliminating candidates

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Knowledge of the ins and outs of running the campus.

Candidate Weaknesses: I just hope she's not woke.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: This candidate has my support. Please bring back the state classified employees mountain campus retreat for the summer, we really miss it.

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Business experience

Candidate Weaknesses: Whole function of the university, mainly been in Administration, not in touch with the whole university. Been shielded of the harsh reality of what is happening/environment on campus.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses: Commitment to DEI and marginalized communities and student populations.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: All students and faculty/staff need to be centered. Not just the ones that impact money and financial interest.

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Legal background, business minded

Candidate Weaknesses: Right hand to Tony Frank in the pass. Didn't take CPC requests seriously. Made it hard to meet with Tony or herself.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Experience as VPUO is very key

Role as CEO of an International company

Candidate Weaknesses: None

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Faculty council are elitist winners that got caudled way to much!

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Female

Candidate Weaknesses: Puppet

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Tony Franks puppet. How can her ideology be different from his when her experience is mostly under Tony Frank's influence.

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Priority Number 1 for our new president needs for be fair and adequate compensation for faculty, staff and student employees!

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Candidate has a long standing history with CSU.

Candidate Weaknesses: Candidate's most recent position is not in higher education.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Did we even see her CV and resume before hand?

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I think we got wind only after her selection

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Look good for me!

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: I appreciate her concern for all State Classified and faculty alike!

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Experience, Already knows most key players and faculty. Well spoken and smart.

Candidate Weaknesses: None.

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: visionary, driven, accessible, gets results and shares the credit!

Candidate Weaknesses: none noted

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

"

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Depth of commitment to and understanding of CSU's mission and vision.

Candidate Weaknesses: n/a

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths: Has been with CSU for a while so she knows systems and programs.

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors:

Employee Classification: State Classified

Candidate Strengths:

Candidate Weaknesses:

Comments for Faculty Council leadership and/or the Board of Governors: Why was there only one finalist? It's a little hard to believe.

