



CU Boulder Staff Council Resolution: ***Concern for Mark Kennedy's Nomination for President of the University of Colorado***

Authors: *John Kelly – NCWIT, Elizabeth Garfield - Office of Undergraduate Education*

Signatories: *Alan Slinkard, Barry Sparks, Betty Rasmussen*

The Boulder Campus Staff Council,

Guided by CU Boulder's 2030 Strategic Goals that call upon all students, faculty, staff, and community members to, "be leader[s] in addressing humanitarian, social, and technological challenges in the 21st century;" and the Colorado Creed, which states:

"As a member of the Boulder community and the University of Colorado Boulder, I agree to:

Act with honor, integrity and accountability in my interactions with students, faculty, staff and neighbors.

Respect the rights of others and accept our differences.

Contribute to the greater good of this community..."

Recognizing that the President of the University of Colorado System is the "principal executive officer" of the university, and serves as the "spokesperson for the university and interpreter of university policy," who is tasked with representing and interpreting "the roles, goals, and needs of the university throughout the state of Colorado;"

Reaffirming the need for executive leadership that has the courage to meaningfully address the systemic inequities that substantially impact the classified, university, temporary, and contract staff members employed at the University of Colorado;

Reaffirming [Policy 10P: Diversity](#), adopted by the University of Colorado Board of Regents on April 20, 1995 and revised August 21, 2008, which states, "the board recognizes and affirms that a respect for diversity requires a sincere willingness on the part of the institution to allow all its diverse stakeholders to share in the decision making process, and that no individual or group shall be marginalized or systematically excluded;"

Recognizing that Mr. Mark Kennedy has been named as the sole finalist for President of the University of Colorado by the Board of Regents;

Noting with concern Mr. Kennedy's legislative record during his 6-year tenure in the U.S. House of Representatives where he sponsored and voted for legislation reflecting views contrary to the university's stated values with regard to diversity and inclusion; voted to oppose workers' protections; opposed scientific inquiry; favored legislation aimed at reducing privacy rights; and blurred the lines between religion and public education, by taking actions which include, but are not limited to:

- i) Co-sponsoring (3) amendments to the U.S. Constitution defining marriage as a union between one man and one woman at the federal, state, and local level, effectively denying tax, insurance, inheritance and other benefits to same sex couples;
- ii) Restricting access to and funding for women's reproductive health care;
- iii) Preventing national funds from being used for Stem Cell Research which directly impacted research at the University of Colorado and impeded scientific advancement;
- iv) Voting against \$84 million in grants for predominately Black and Hispanic colleges;
- v) Denying non-emergency healthcare due to lack of funds for Medicare patients;
- vi) Removing environmental protections for endangered species;

- vii) Approving legislation to allow electronic surveillance without a warrant;
- viii) Requiring K-12 students to recite the Pledge of Allegiance during class;

Emphasizing the impossible task of meaningfully participating in the decision-making process during the short 14-day waiting period, with only one hour allotted for each campus forum, before the Regents will vote on Mr. Kennedy's nomination;

Taking into consideration [The Open Letter to the Regents](#) which was delivered to the Board of Regents on April 15th, complete with 4,626 signatures from members of our campus community including: 1,869 students, 968 alumni, 434 faculty members, 287 parents, 239 staffers, 182 residents and 647 who didn't identify their affiliations as well as [The Open letter to the University of Colorado Community](#) from Mr. Kennedy authored and released on April 12th;

1. Calls Upon the University of Colorado Board of Regents to seek consent from the remaining top candidates for the release of their names and profiles for consideration by the entire campus community and invites all consenting candidates to take part in forums similar to those Mr. Mark Kennedy is holding at each campus;
2. Strongly urges all students, faculty, and staff to recognize the importance of voicing their concerns during Mr. Mark Kennedy's forum on April 26th on Boulder's campus and to participate in the question and answer session during the event as well as the campus conversations being held that day;
3. Respectfully requests that forum attendees be given ample time to ask questions without prior vetting and with the opportunity for follow-up questions or comments;
4. Notes with strong concern University of Central Florida's Board of Trustees' decision not to hire Mr. Kennedy as president, citing his divisive political career as an unnecessary level of risk and what has been described as a "funding disaster" at the University of North Dakota;
5. Invites Dr. Brenda J. Allen, Vice Chancellor for Diversity and Inclusion at the University of Colorado Denver, nominated by Boulder Faculty Council as an advisor to the presidential search committee, to advise the Board of Regents on how Mr. Mark Kennedy's appointment would impact CU's diversity and inclusion efforts;
6. Welcomes efforts made to lengthen the comment and review process by the Board of Regents to enable the campus community to meaningfully participate in the decision-making process;
7. Directs Boulder Staff Council representatives to encourage widespread participation by staff constituents and colleagues at open forums and through feedback processes already in place so that more and diverse voices will be heard, and a wide array of opinions can be shared with the Board of Regents prior to their final vote on this candidate;
8. Calls Upon the University of Colorado Board of Regents to formally withdraw their consideration of Mark Kennedy for President of the University of Colorado.

Resolution passed by the Boulder Campus Staff Council on 18th day of April, 2019.



Jessica Gammey Gardner, Co-Chair



Heather Martin, Co-Chair

Additional Signatories:

Carrie Sadler

Chad Bucholtz

Lillian Bisantz

CA

Rebecca Kallemeyn

brandy monckton

Jack Wertheimer

Chelsea E

Jacob Van Veldhuizen

Lindsey Fell

Jannie Fernandez

Lyn Swackhamer

Christopher Bell

Eva W Bradshaw

Laura Burfield

Jamie Skerski

*Scott Zeman, UCB A&S
Advising*

Lisa Christian

Rachel Kammen

Rebecca Stossmeister

Jan Baulsir

Heather Martin, Staff

Craig Williams II

Dylan West

Kelly Ilseng

Velda Khoo

*Jennifer Stroh, University
Staff*

Micah A. Stoltz

L. Kaifa Roland

AJ Fosdick

Beth Sholes

Olivia Hirschey Marrese

Christina Meyers

Martin Streim

Mitchell Wolfe

Cassi Strain

Andrew K Morgan

Rachel Kammen

Molly Halsey

Linda M. Nicita

Paul Erhard

Prof. Kira Hall

Jade A. Gutiérrez

Jeremy Darling

Cynthia G Pickett

Judith Packer Jesudason

Daniel Page

TJ Alladin

Alexandra Romanova

Laura A. Michaelis

J Stitt

Héctor Ramírez

Mariana Galvez Seminario

Steven G. Carson

Lori Walker

*Distinguished Professor
Charles Wilkinson*

*Clint Carroll, CU Boulder
Faculty*

Ben Weihrauch

Andrea Patzer

Brendan Griffiths

Allison Mundorff

Chase Wesley Raymond

Sharon Van Boven

Adriane M Bradberry

Alexa Van Dalsem

Adrienne M OConnell

Lynn Rodenhizer

Melissa Clymer

Jenny Primm

brad mclain

Joan Gabriele

Jeremy Plotkin

Nadia Brecl

W.F. Preston Cumming

Tarah Dykeman

David Welch

James Walker

Kelly L. Simmons

R. Keller Kimbrough

Scarlet Bowen

Carolyn Salter

Laura E Wright

Cara Lammey

Carla Jones

Barbara A McDonald

Michael Shernick

Shelly Sommer

Kim Cho

Diana Wilson

Ann Marie Ladd

Angela Galik

Marcel Junige

Brandon Noirot

Anne Wilson

Gregory Stauffer

Sara E Smith

Virginia Schultz

J.W. Reinke

Dawn Fettig

Greg Roers

Seth Myers

Joy K. Adams, Ph.D.

Michele Ritter

Resolution Statistics:

Support	87.39%	104
Does Not Support	12.61%	15
Total	100%	119

Supporter Feedback on Resolution:

- Boulder Campus Staff Council welcomes your feedback. Please use the field below to share your thoughts regarding the Presidential Nomination of Mark Kennedy and/or this Resolution.
- I don't understand how this guy became our only finalist. He's rotten.
- One only needs to look at his resume to see he is just going to use CU as another stepping stone in his career.
- Mark Kennedy would not move this System forward. He has provided no explanation for his supposed changes in his congressional positions and further, during the System forum, said that he did not think it was fair for people to bring up his congressional record.
- I truly have concerns for how Mark Kennedy will affect our institution, both on the issues of diversity/equality and fundraising. I find his past record (both politically and as president at North Dakota) to be concerning and highly problematic.
- Please reconsider this candidate for the presidential nomination.
- Thank you Staff Council. This statement clearly organizes many of the worries (and goals) that myself and a number of colleagues are grappling with.
- Thanks for taking the time to meet and put this together. I think this aptly summarizes concerns and that it presents a clear path forward to the Board of Regents.
- CU is a large, dynamic and diverse institution of higher education and must have a leader who reflects the goals and communities that are served by the University. It is clear to me that the sole choice of the regents for this position has neither the background, relevant experience or belief systems to lead in this capacity. It is a travesty that he has been nominated as the only choice.
- In my personal opinion as an independent citizen, I feel that Mark Kennedy is a poor choice to represent CU Boulder in any way. I feel the Board of Regents can make a better choice.
- I would like to add my name back to the document. Thank you.
- I strongly express my concerns with Mr. Mark Kennedy's nomination as President of CU, noting his record for lack of support for diversity and minority communities, as well as his lackluster resume as the University President in his previous job at the University of North Dakota

- Mark Kennedy, as evidenced by his voting record while a member of US congress, does not reflect the values of the University of Colorado or the state of Colorado.
- We deserve and can do better than Mark Kennedy for CU.
- I support the Resolution: Concern for Mr. Mark Kennedy's Nomination for President of the University of Colorado and oppose the nomination of Mr. Mark Kennedy for CU President for the reasons listed in the Resolution.
- In addition to a voting record that gives ample evidence of his values which stand in opposition of core values of the people of CU, Kennedy's qualifications for this role are in question. I strongly urge the reconsideration of this candidate.
- Having twice graduated from CU Boulder and having been a lecturer and teaching assistant, I concur with this resolution. It is now more important than ever to have a CU president that believes and acts consistently with regard to the ethical and moral responsibilities of this role. Many individuals can manage - few can lead.
- A politician, of any flag, is a terrible idea. Terrible.
- I am concerned with the honesty and authenticity of Mark Kennedy. I do not feel like he is a good fit for the CU System.
- Mark Kennedy is not the right leader for the University of Colorado.
- I want to express concern at the inaccessibility of the open forum with Mark Kennedy. It is one hour during the middle of the work day. CU employees without benefits, or even with benefits, have to take time off in order to attend. The time of the event is excluding many full-time students, faculty, and staff at CU Boulder, ESPECIALLY considering that it is rapidly approaching the end of the semester when many of the community members at CU cannot take time out of their work days.
- This is a classic case of someone failing upward. Why, given the candidate's performance in his current position, would CU want to hire him?
- I completely agree with your resolution. I livestreamed the entire April 26, 2019 forum held at Macky. Although Mr. Kennedy seems like a pleasant enough man, he has no evident qualities that make him stand out for the CU Presidency, and no evident connections to Colorado, unlike our previous two presidents. There are also the many negatives that have come to light about Kennedy's background. I cannot understand what possessed the regents to vote unanimously for him as sole finalist.
- Without the support of faculty, students and staff this candidate cannot be an effective leader. We must ensure that the campus community sees a slate of candidates. What interest could possibly be served by putting forward just one candidate?
- I think this is a great resolution and hope it helps us understand Mr. Kennedy's opinions.
- In addition to all that has been explicitly stated in this resolution, I would also like to cite the report of ethical misconduct recently published by the CU system faculty council in expressing my opposition to Mark Kennedy's nomination. It is abundantly clear (based on that report, this resolution, and Mr. Kennedy's own testimony) that Mark Kennedy is not the kind of leader who makes decisions swiftly and with integrity, nor does he have a history of taking clear stances to support vulnerable populations. In fact, just the opposite is true.
- The Board of Regents should know that selecting only one finalist, regardless of his qualifications, history, or political persuasion, does not look good to the CU community at large. If the other candidates were so poor that one rose so far above the others, it does not inspire much confidence in the search process. Does the University of Colorado have such low stature in the global academic community that Mr. Kennedy is truly the best we can get?

- Mediocre candidate with an inadequate background. We should be striving for the very best.

- Thank you for raising these concerns that amplify the voices of CU faculty who share them. It is critically important that the Regents take into full consideration the views of the CU community on this matter in a democratic and transparent way.

- We need a President with strong ties (a native would be great!) to Colorado who understands Colorado politics, key Coloradans as well as all kinds of folks who make up this great state and live in all corners of it. We need our state legislature to increase support to all our campuses. We need a President who knows lots of Alumni and University supporters. We need our Foundation to remain strong and well-funded. I just don't see that Mr. Kennedy fits these needs.

- As I shared with the Regents on their comment form, Mr. Kennedy's record and his performance on campus visits have been extremely disappointing. Both his record and the visits confirm that he is not an adequate candidate for the president of the University. The University of Colorado is a world-class institution and should have an ethical, experienced, inclusive leader at its helm. Kennedy is not that person.

- Thank you. In addition to having concerns regarding Mr. Kennedy's views and past actions regarding LGBTQ and Diversity, women's right to choose and worker rights, I am very concerned about Mr. Kennedy's views and past actions regarding climate change and the environment - both of which the University has world renown research status for.

- He is the wrong selection for a progressive university. He has not supported STEM cell research nor diversity.

- Thank you for writing this!

- Thank you for taking action and allowing staff more of a voice on this important issue.

- Mark Kennedy seems like a very weak candidate to lead such a fine university. His background is very underwhelming. There are so many issues that he does not appear to understand. Please reconsider his nomination.

- In a recent CU Connections article about Mr. Kennedy, he said at an open forum for CU System staff that it's not fair to look at his votes in Congress since he's not running for Congress. However, in a recent Daily Camera article about the Anschutz campus open forum, Mr. Kennedy referred to his votes in Congress as proof of his bona fides to run the University. Either his votes in Congress matter or they don't. It can't be both ways when the situation suits the candidate or others. Careful analysis of these sorts of arguments need to be made and considered by the Board of Regents before a decision is made.

- Mark Kennedy's weak performance in business and higher education leadership positions, and his acceptance of racist incidents at the University of North Dakota, make him unacceptable as a candidate for this position. His sequence of public relations disasters at UND, including alienating a major donor, also do not inspire confidence. Throw him back and look harder for a candidate who is has actually demonstrated skills in line with the qualifications for this job.

- I ask that the Board of Regents respectfully and formally withdraw their consideration of Mark Kennedy. This person is not a good match for the University's Strategic Goals. His views and record are contrary to the university's stated values regarding diversity and inclusion. He voted to oppose workers' protections and opposed scientific inquiry. He favored legislation aimed at reducing privacy rights and blurred the lines between religion and public education. He is not a person that should be leading our esteem university.

- As a Chairperson and faculty member for over 25 years, I am highly concerned that Mark Kennedy does not reflect values that exist among the majority of students, faculty, staff, administrators, philanthropists and others who directly support the university. Susan Sharkey is pursuing an agenda that does not align with other regents and CU as a university renowned for

innovation, inclusion, and higher minded approaches. Mark Kennedy has a track record that does not reflect progressive values consistent with a university that has spawned Nobel laureates and transformative medical techniques. Progress must be maintained and requires a President who can open doors rather than close doors.

-
- We need a dynamic person who can truly represent the world-renowned System that the University of Colorado is! We are leading in research from climate to aerospace to heritage grains to medicine, we champion sustainability and environmental justice - all this must be in the forefront of the President's skill set and values. Thanks so much for taking a stand on our behalf!
-
- Something is amiss in River City (A Music Man reference) with this decision. Either Mr. Kennedy is saying what we want to hear to sell himself or our Board of Regents no longer supports the values we so strongly profess to our students, staff, faculty, donors, and communities. Who is flim flanning whom here? If we are a Top 100 in the world university, how is it after a yearlong search we end up at this point with a candidate with demonstrated counter values? The Board of Regents needs to pass on Mr. Kennedy and demonstrate their support for the values stated in our vision, codes, and documents.
-
- Mark Kennedy is not a good fit for the University of Colorado. His background on civil rights, LGBTQ, education, women's reproductive rights, stem cell research.... and much more make that assertion very clear. In addition, Kennedy's poor ratings from the ACLU, National Education Association, AFL-CIO, NARAL and American Public Health Network are strong indicators that this candidate is not a good match for the innovative and progressive trajectory of CU.
-
- Thank you for your efforts to highlight these issues on behalf of staff and voice our concerns to the regents. Here's hoping they will listen and reconsider their nomination.
-
- I hope everything in the limited power of "staff" can be done to keep this man off our campus!
-
- The search process was clearly neither transparent nor in-depth. I found Mr. Kennedy's unethical voting record with a single Google search. I am disappointed in the Regents for their decision to encourage an atmosphere of divisiveness and antagonism. We should be hiring the best possible candidate, not Kennedy.
-
- I support the CU Boulder Staff Council Resolution: Concern for Mark Kennedy's Nomination for President of the University of Colorado and oppose the nomination of Mark Kennedy for President of the University of Colorado.
-
- I strongly support this entire Resolution against the nomination of Mark Kennedy!
-
- I do not support the nomination of Mark Kennedy as his record demonstrates values contrary to those of the University of Colorado. Students and faculty should have more opportunity to participate in the election process. Mark Kennedy does not represent the people or the institution of CU.
-
- I posed the following to the Board of Regents and asked that these questions not be watered down, but asked on 4/26: Given the many concerns about Mark Kennedy's hard and soft skills, including his "business" approach to academic downsizing and leadership abilities on the cultural side, my recommendation for the Board of Regents' process is to improve the Behavioral Interviews, and also add a Case Interview with a panel of business and academic experts on Friday morning. Both interview types are ones that any job seeker should be familiar with, including a 20-something MBA. Case Interview On the business side, as of yesterday (4/23) Mark defended needing to make huge cuts at UND, axing the women's hockey team and various fields of study. This is reminiscent of the "buzz-saw AI" approach of his earlier time and limited skill set as a CPA, yet he expressed no other choice in making these hard decisions. Today's business and academic leaders find growth, not simply through cuts to improve bottom lines, but through investment and creative approaches to build new areas of focus reflective of where the world is now and is heading, such as consumers, demographic shifts and technology. At DU, for

example, the university's engineering school through its Media Project, has found a creative way to support the media vertical through nonprofit partnerships. The Dean is a modern, successful businessperson roughly Mark's age and sees the value of reaching out to form public-private-nonprofit partnerships to place the university at the center of innovation. Media is a tough business, yet vital to our communities; a university need not only participate alone in high growth, standalone, financially sustaining entities but can partner to keep critical aspects of our society financially sustainable at universities through partnerships and accessing creating sources of capital. Giving Mark case studies of problems involving actual challenges facing the university – how he would solve problems for every part of the university regardless of product lifecycle, if you will – would be helpful. As of today, he hasn't shown a growth leader's mindset and defends abandoning programs that are doing well elsewhere. That's interviewing 101 for any entry level job out of business school. Questions are not provided in advance. Behavioral Interview some very pointed questions are in order: 1) Please discuss the time at George Washington University when you were reportedly accused of creating a hostile environment and discriminating against a student for being gay. 2) Please discuss the time multiple employees reportedly said or reported that they witnessed or were subject to unlawful or inappropriate discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation committed by or from you. 3) In any place where you have worked, how many complaints have been made against you for creating a hostile environment, or inappropriate or unlawful discrimination against a student or employee for being gay? 4) What did you do during your tenure at George Washington University to better manage the university's policies that lessened or contributed to the university's Federal probe over sexual harassment? MY RESEARCH (there are citations, yet not included in this communication) After reading the negative press surrounding the Board of Regents' process and selection of Mark Kennedy as single finalist for CU President, I wrote in to ask that the Board be transparent with the process and also to separate fact from fiction from Kennedy's record. This letter, received on 4/22/2019 (attached), satisfies neither of these requests. Further, after listening to the CO Public Radio summary of 4/23 meetings on this matter, my research has illustrated that many issues have not yet been addressed. What's At Stake? Jared Polis has written a statement to CU asking the university find a leader that unites the Board. Let's stop to think about how CU is funded. Imagine what could be lost to Colorado and our economy if the selection of Mark Kennedy as President Results in CU losing opportunities such as some partnership my department is pursuing, or state grants to help with early cybersecurity education in K-12 school systems. It's one of countless examples. Issues with Kennedy's Leadership and Discrimination Complaints in Academia. That morale is reportedly low at UND, a function of Mark's leadership, was reported by a 26-year veteran of Minnesota Public Radio in April 2018. Only 20 months on the job at UND during which time Mark cut the women's hockey team among other controversial decisions, he applied for an opening for president at the University of Central Florida. Kennedy didn't get it. Media reports show that, prior to UND, Kennedy began his academic career at George Washington University after losing a race for the U.S. Senate, where he reportedly insisted upon being called "The Honorable." At GW's Graduate School of Political Management in June 2013, Kennedy was accused of creating a hostile environment and discriminating against a student for being gay. Other GW employees said or reported that they witnessed or were subject to unlawful or inappropriate discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation committed by or from Mark Kennedy. GW University has faced a Federal probe over reports of sexual harassment that may tie to Mark's tenure with GW, which started in 2012. Kennedy's Voting Record. Members of the Board of Regents have been stating, per media reports, that Mark's voting record while in public office doesn't matter and telling students to meet the person before casting judgment. This is, at best, naive and something these same students and other upstanding and accomplished members of the CU community are more worldly and wise than to accept. Mark has been criticized as being a better talker than listener.

Yet, it is clear that he has, for example, voted as an adult to limit the rights of his fellow man, whether it be on LGBTQ rights or abortion rights in a world facing a sexual assault epidemic, to advance his own political and personal agenda. Mark has never once publicly apologized for his past actions from any records I can find. In Mark's letter to CU, he tried to normalize his views by saying others' views have evolved as well and stated he would do things differently today, which is not acceptance of responsibility or an apology. On the issues, here are some of Mark's ratings: Rated 7% by the ACLU, indicating an anti-civil rights voting record. (Dec 2002) Rated 17% by the NEA, indicating anti-public education votes. (Dec 2003) Rated 0% by APHA, indicating an anti-public health voting record. (Dec 2003) 0 points on a social scale that Sexual orientation is protected by civil rights laws (strongly opposes). Holes in the Selection Process. Several holes in the story in defense of the process of nominating Mark exist, a key one being how one Board member tweeted that new information had come to light about Kennedy after the announcement was public, and students and others in the community were unearthing information. The information, such as his voting record while in public office and allegations of creating a hostile environment in academia, seemed to have been erroneously omitted from the search firm's work, per that Board member's accord. None of this new information is addressed in the 4/22 letter. Instead, the letter is written in a defensive manner, bringing up early succession planning seemingly to divert attention from the fact that the relevant part of the process has had a duration of roughly one month, and the new, negative information that has come to light was left out of this communication completely. Kennedy talks about his voting record while in government as if it were ancient history and irrelevant. He was born in 1957 and is 62 years old. Are we really to believe he was a clueless child during the period in which he was 40-56 years old? He was voted out of office and tried to shift his career to academia, where he was then accused of the same anti-LGBTQ behavior that he promoted in public office, creating a hostile environment. If this is true, his business experience in the retail industry, which looks nothing like it did decades ago, is even more irrelevant and should be tossed from the decision process. Political Party Affiliations, or those who say that CU just cannot handle diversity of thought in an effort to silence anyone opposing this candidate, that is simply not the case. Bruce Benson is known for moderate Republican views and the department I work in has a mix of political affiliations. We find common ground on many issues and importantly in our work, largely around cybersecurity. You can have diversity of beliefs and do no harm to disadvantaged groups, and achieve high morale. Why Our Values Matter HOW one succeeds and IN WHICH CIRCLES matters often more than the accomplishments themselves. For example, Wall Street titans who profited from the mass foreclosures of our fellow Americans' homes following the financial crisis may be wealthy, but how they accomplished this, and in what circles (other white collar people who deserve our ire, whether they did jail time or not) diminishes their standing in the RIGHT circles. In the RIGHT circles, the leader may not greedily amass as much for him or herself along the way leaving a trail of destruction behind, but brings people with him or her, so a rising tide lifts all boats. The best ideas come forward because all ideas and diverse perspectives are considered. The environment is empowering, fearless. Mark's version of success has only been achieved in conservative environments among like-minded people comfortable denying others equal rights to gain and keep power. Our students see this. They see the potential for innovation and achievement could be held by back such a culture and leader. The best people with the best ideas can only be found when EVERYONE is given a chance to help us tackle the many challenging problems and opportunities facing our globe today. We don't want to lose those people, the people who could have changed the world, if only we gave them an environment in which to be their best selves. Executive Search Errors and omissions by consultants end up with the consultants being sued for damages in the real world. Further, I am happy to share the Executive Search firm my business school, Kellogg, used to find our new Dean this past year. Our Students Are Our Customers The process and communications from the

Board of Regents seen in the press have been paternal and condescending to student leaders, our customers, which I do not find acceptable. There's an element of bullying at the hand of one member of the Board of Regents taking place in very public interaction with our students, which has been interpreted as attempts to silence them. Our students know and deserve better, and I can feel their justifiable frustration. Call to Action It's time to cut losses, quit throwing good money and time at bad, and get back on the right path with the people who share our values — ranging from doing quality research and addressing the issues mentioned above. It's then, that the right leader will emerge.

Non Supporter Feedback on Resolution:

- I believe that this resolution is poorly worded, the eighth item negates the need and relevance of the previous seven. Also, if you had an issue with the comment period that was given, you should have addressed that grievance when you were presented with the formal process several months ago. Being politically angry is all well and good, but you should be angry about the process regardless of the candidate. Otherwise you are just being political, specifically with a liberal ideology, and I think individual council members are not doing a good job representing their constituents if that is the case.
 - I heard through the newspaper that the Staff Council had grave concerns about this single finalist. I would like to point out, no one asked if I did before the article was printed this weekend 4/20/19. It was just there that staff council objects. NOW (4/25/19) you are asking for feedback. I am offended. The CU Board of Regents, who are elected officials by the populous of Colorado, have provided information about the steps in their vetting process all along the way. I have never once felt out of the loop or not informed. I believe they have done their due diligence with appropriate respect and consideration of the constituents. This blanket response of descent due to the lack of options or a voting record from 20 years ago seems knee-jerk and ill informed. As an institute of higher education we boast that we value and promote diverse opinions and ideas. This rushed judgement and lack of willingness to hear out the candidate, learn more about the individual and their vision and values for the University is extremely closed minded. I am embarrassed for us.
 - I am SHOCKED that you are taking such drastic measures when you received signatures from merely 5% of students, faculty and staff, and even less from alumni and residents This does NOT represent the whole school!!!! I, for one, am happy with the nomination. I do not at all believe in so-called "reproductive rights" and I believe in the right for every person to live (including babies) and I despise the killing of innocent people (also babies). Do NOT assume that 5% of us means 95% of us. This is an outrage.
-

General Feedback on Resolution:

- What if the Board of Regents were to release footage/transcript of the final interview: would that help us to understand his thinking & what questions were asked, to know what it is that caused the Board to name his as the only finalist? That could help us all avoid asking the same questions that may have already been answered. Also, I only discovered today that all of the forums for this week are being recorded & are accessible via a single web page: that would have been good to know; all concerned could watch each one & learn what questions have already been asked & answered. (It would also have been good to show us all of the questions submitted for the

forums, and which ones were approved & why.) I disagree that complete withdrawal is a reasonable request, but I do agree that more time is needed for this "stakeholder vetting process" and the bylaws should be changed to reflect that for future searches for presidents & chancellors. Frankly, I think that shifting the timeline of the process forward 2 days due to a "media leak" is an indication of a serious problem: who leaked the info? Were all involved parties 'sworn' to secrecy?