

Affiliation (optional)	Candidate Strengths	Candidate Weaknesses	Other Comments
Administration	Well-read. Diverse experiences outside of higher education	While his experiences outside higher education help him look at issues through a different lens, the jump to being president at a large, complex institution at Iowa would be extremely difficult. I don't believe he would be successful. His knowledge of issues such as outcomes assessment (as highlighted in his comments about Academically Adrift) were on the surface. He simply isn't in the same league as the other three candidates. I also believe he'd struggle with external constituents and, in particular, would not be a strong fundraiser.	Of the four candidates, I believe he is the weakest and Dr. Steinmetz is the strongest. I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback and participate in the open forums. Thank you!
Administration		It is unfortunate that the error in Mr. Harreld's resume was not identified earlier in the vetting process, that his LLC (2014-present) referred to his consulting work while living in Massachusetts and is no longer active. While the error/inaccuracy may be reasonably explained, in most recruitments, any sort of error or misrepresentation would be cause for disqualification.	
Administration	Strong knowledge of organizational leadership and organizational change. Was very insightful of underlying issues and challenges.	Ability to be accepted by the campus. He would have the most significant transition, including the period of adjustment and opportunity to develop trust and credibility with campus and external constituencies.	
Administration	Success in the business sector. Knowledge of organizations in general.	Does not meet stated qualifications, and more importantly, does not appear to understand the nuance of current issues facing academia, or the major differences between the private and academic sectors.	This candidate is highly UNQUALIFIED to serve as President of the University of Iowa.
Administration	Someone who will challenge us to be better and improve. Clearly a great leader. We need this one.	Not from within Higher Education but clearly eager and capable of learning and working with constituents	Best of the 4
Administration	I believe he would be an amazing president, one that I find none would transform UI into the next 100 years of greatness. He is creative, easy to visit with, will listen and act in ways that are the best for UI.		I know that there will be much noise from some parts of campus because he is not PhD in some small field, but for me that it a very real plus. I would love for the BOR to make this bold move. Transform UI.
Faculty		The candidate's c.v. is far too thin to be the president of a major research university. This is disappointing.	It is OK to consider business leaders for the job. However, you need to find us stronger candidates as UI is the flagship university for the State of Iowa.

Faculty	Energetic and earnest	Entirely too unfamiliar with academic institutions	Like the other candidates, this candidate expressed a desire to help the University improve. He did not provide details about how to do this and I don't think he has the background to provide them. He lacks an understanding of the ways in which an institution such as ours can improve. I do not mean to disparage him. As I indicated above, I think he is energetic and earnest. He just does not have the experience and understanding to do the job.
Faculty	I don't think this candidate is qualified to be president of the university.	I work with students all the time on creating resumes and cover letters which explain to employers how their skills, knowledge and experiences as CLAS majors are transferable. I work with the advisors at the Pomerantz Career Center to organize career luncheons which bring in a range of people from the community to talk to students about their careers. What struck me about this candidate was that he was not able to explain to us how his business skills and experiences were transferable to running a university. He gave a very poor presentation.	
Faculty	Has been successful in his life	Does not seem to have an appreciation for universities and how the function	I think it is impossible to overlook the error on his CV. I don't see how we can trust him. I don't think he would be able to engage with the faculty.
Faculty	Offers whatever benefits come from having someone come to us from totally different fields.	Demonstrated a very thin understanding of higher education in general and the University of Iowa in particular. Has no demonstrated prior commitment to higher education or its central values. Failed to handle hostile questions well--he lacked the ability to win over a skeptical crowd, which bodes very poorly for his long-term future here.	I applaud the search committee for considering an "out of the box" candidate, but Mr. Harreid himself is not a good exemplar of such a candidate.
Faculty		I do not feel he should be a finalist. His treatment of his own resume demonstrates a cavalier approach that indicates a lack of knowledge and lack of commitment to the nuance and regulation that simply goes with higher ed.	His resume even as it betrays a downward trajectory. From IBM to Harvard Business to consulting from Colorado. No explanation for the moves.
Faculty		Intellectual honesty is at the core of any university. If, as suggested during the public forum, Mr. Harreid, misrepresented his background on his CV he should no longer be considered a viable candidate. Furthermore, at this very high level, it makes little difference whether the failure to remove the LLC connection was a deliberate attempt to mislead or, as suggested, a thoughtless oversight. Neither situation place this candidate in a favorable light.	

Faculty	Mr. Harreld displayed no significant strengths for the office of President of The University of Iowa.	<p>Mr. Harreld could not articulate his reasons for diverting his career and wanting to be the President of an academic institution. His expressed reason was that the thought he could help us through - but what we needed to pass through was vague. He wanted Iowa to be the "Midwestern Ivy" but never defined what that status implied. When one deviates from a traditional career path, it would be expected that one would do a great deal of homework to not only understand the specific situation but also the culture and vernacular. However, it was obvious that he had not done his homework with respect to the University of Iowa. He paid lip-service to terms like "shared governance", "diversity" and "transparency" without fully understanding their implications for a University and how those concepts would alter his job. He made the choice to use expletives in his prepared remarks as well as in the question and answer session. The expectations for the President would be to represent the University in a range of public forums. It would be hoped that that individual would have a better command of language and advanced communication skills that would make those language choices unacceptable. He failed to supply an accurate CV as was pointed out and he admitted to, as his company is not an LLC in Colorado. It is concerning that he would let an important regulatory commitment lapse. The President is faced with a multitude of regulatory obligations that must be honored in a timely manner. Even when asked relatively simple questions like "what did you do at any of your companies to improve conditions for staff?" - he was unable to name anything, not even a wellness program or casual Fridays that he had spearheaded to improve conditions for staff. He became belligerent to questioners. Even if the questions were bordering on rude, he should have handled them and the situation more diplomatically. He did not commit to being the chief advocate for the University of Iowa. He proposed a nebulous idea about "testing" to measure student performance (i.e., "Iowa tests", ACT analogy). The "Great to Greater" concept was never defined let alone presented in</p> <p>NO experience with administering a complex academic institution. Not able to engage with students, faculty, staff, or the community - this was painfully evident in the town hall meeting.</p>	<p>I attended all four forums in their entirety. The three previous candidates were superb and I am certain would represent the University of Iowa very capably. In my opinion, Mr. Harreld did not seem to understand the role of a President of a major University and would be unprepared and ill-equipped to assume this office.</p>
Faculty	Expertise in corporate arenas	<p>That was a horrible meeting. I ended up frustrated about the selection of the candidate and embarrassed about bringing him in. I was disappointed not only in his candidacy but also a fair amount of disrespect directed at the candidate, who is a very successful person in his own realm. However he is definitely a poor fit for the University. If the board of regents selects this candidate, it will send a painfully clear message it neither respects nor values the students, faculty, or staff at the University of Iowa.</p>	
Faculty	general leadership skills personable	<p>no experience in leadership at any level whatsoever at an academic institution. he used terms like academic freedom and shared governance at the open forum, but based on his answers to questions, I don't think that he has any concept of what these terms truly mean.</p>	<p>I was skeptical going into the open forum, but I tried to keep an open mind. His responses at the open forum were terrible. It is clear to me that he does not understand academic institutions. It is an insult to us that he was even brought in as a finalist. Shame on the search committee.</p>

Faculty

He is a confident and polished speaker who is very effective in communicating vision and connecting with an audience. He has an extensive corporate background of successful and bold implementation of changes to bring financial and brand improvements large and small corporations. He has colleagues in the university administration and teaches at Harvard to some extent. In the private meetings, the most positive thing I took away from conversations with Herreid was that he could be a great person to call in to a university as a strategic advisor. He is probably the type of person you would call in (smaller than our large Tier study) to further identify peripheral things a university does (cost of running power plant versus purchasing power locally - it may not be cost effective to do that - or outsource running of power plant for example). I think it would be great if he was a consultant to the regents institutions on such transformational issues.

It is really difficult to find much public background information on him. His CV was only 3 pages long thus there is not much vetting or analysis of his past achievements or university-relevant activities that can be done. This leads to him being a very risky candidate for our very public UI presidency. He seems to bristle with reports on his past activities by the local press - UI presidents will need a thick skin in managing the local media outlets. He could come here and rightly presume that offering him the position means we (= BOR, legislature, and UI community) buy into his ideas for making really big "transformative" (and irreversible) changes to the UI infrastructure and possibly academic system. We are here now to ensure education for current students and to do things that will secure the reputation and viability of this university for the next generation. I am worried that Herreid will be looking at a short-term several year timeline to make an impact here that could (inadvertently) cause long-term harm to UI. As president, he will be the ultimate decision maker on hiring and promotion at UI and in the public forum did not really clearly convey that he understood the critical factors involved in faculty instruction and research at a major research institution.

The public forum revealed that his listed current position at Executing Strategy was an error (and in line 3 of his IBM note he missed "I" in IBM. There could be thought of as just sloppy, but I know that there is a history of corporate America tossing out executives who "lied" on their resumes. I would not want to start our prestigious UI presidency on that note. In hindsight, his nomination to the final candidate list was bold and risky. It would have been better if he had interviewed earlier where the contrast of him with others would have been clearer. I am embarrassed by the small vocal number of faculty/students/staff/AND alumni who were disrespectful in their tone and manner with some of the public questions. I hope the BOR looks past that to the broader issues and concerns that Herreid himself raised by his answers and statements (sadly as a friend of Mitch Daniels he should really have been able to better prepare for his UI campus visit in the way a US presidential candidate would prepare.....).

Faculty

Candidness on some issues. His answer to the rape question was the most direct of the four.

No experience in academic administration, no experience in non profit fund raising, no obvious connections with the intellectual process outside the business world, a cv that inaccurately reflects his current work situation, and indications throughout his presentation that he had not done his homework on crucial issues for us. He is simply not competent in the areas needed for this position.

His learning curve would be extremely, even possibly steep, and that in a climate that I'm afraid would be hostile to his making any progress. We do not need an amateur as our president. We need intellectual as well as financial leadership, and I did not get that from his presentation. I find it difficult to understand why the committee made him a finalist. Did they not do their fact checking on his cv? I am also disturbed by the tone and substance a Harvard profile that suggests while at IBM he approved of "public hangings" of non productive employees. How would that translate to running a non profit, academic organization? He is probably smart enough to know he'd need to use other tactics for change, but he gave no real indications in his presentation of how he would adapt, or even that he knew what the problems were.

Faculty	None, in this context.	At the public forum, Mr. Harreid did not manage to show that he had a grasp of basic notions in academia, such as the meaning of tenure. It is hard to imagine how he could run a university without an understanding of how a university operates and what it actually does. His performance at the public forum was frankly painful to watch.	I think it is possible to imagine someone with a business background who could be an effective university president. However, Mr. Harreid is not that person.
Faculty	Business skills	Lack of any relevant academic experience; arrogance and inability to understand even basic questions and concerns regarding a public university	An embarrassment: his misleading and incompetent resume alone should have prevented him from being taken seriously by the search firm; he would not be taken seriously as a candidate for an Assistant Professor position at any credible university. His public forum was a shambles.
Faculty	None	Lack of knowledge of the University or academics in general; inability to relate to or understand students, faculty, or staff; poor demeanor in public forum; questionable leadership skills	Hiring this person as University President would foster distrust and rancor on campus. The nature of the public forum showed that the members of the campus community do want this man as a leader.
Faculty	Good communicator, background in business would seem appealing to some.	UNTRUSTWORTHY--falsified his own CV. We don't accept this behavior in students and certainly shouldn't accept it in a University President.	He would generate major hostility among many people at the University--operating without faculty support is extremely dangerous.

Faculty

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the candidates for President of the University of Iowa. I am very concerned about J. Bruce Harreld as a candidate for President. I believe that he does not have the experience and background that are required to lead a University. I say this based on my own experience as a faculty member at the University of Iowa, as a member of the Advisory Boards and the Board of Directors of several companies and foundations, and as a consultant to multiple large and small companies. I think that previous experience and a leadership position in a university are essential for the following reasons. 1. Previous university experience provides an understanding of a university's diverse missions, the strengths and limitations of the university structure, and the competing demands on its human and financial resources. 2. It informs the President of the faculty's responsibilities, aspirations, and challenges. 3. Previous university leadership provides knowledge and understanding of the needs, expectations, opportunities, and challenges for our students. 4. It enables a leader to be aware of and effectively respond to the university's varied constituents at the local, state, national, and international levels. For all these reasons, I hope you will not further consider the candidacy of J. Bruce Harreld. Thank you for your consideration.

Faculty

good presenter, past business success, has taught business classes, nice guy, handles uncomfortable moments well.

He does not have a Ph.D. and for this reason cannot understand what it takes to become an academic and excel in a long-term research program; that is, he cannot understand or appreciate the life of our faculty. He cannot understand what aspects of research are really of value and what aspects can perhaps be sacrificed because he has never been in a group that evaluates a research proposal, as all of the faculty at UI have. He does not articulate well the value of research in the Arts and Humanities, thinking that research belongs mostly to the Medical School, and teaching is the responsibility of the College of liberal arts and sciences. He would never have the confidence of the faculty, and without this he would not be an effective leader. He would bring the university from Great to Lesser. The state has one university where the majority of the society-enhancing research is done, and this is the UI. The attempt to fund the UI, Iowa State, and UNI the same amount, when their functions and contributions are vastly different, reflects the ignorance and arrogance of the Regents. When asked about this issue the candidate revealed his own lack of understanding. He cannot be trusted to make the case that the UI is an absolute treasure, by virtue of its research mission, and to destroy it will injure the state, its people, and the larger society in ways that perhaps only professors can grasp--because we have devoted every day of our lives to doing this important work.

Bruce could perhaps be hired as a consultant; he is not qualified to be the president of a major research university. I thought the company hired to run this show did a poor job; the Q and A got out of hand; there was no one to enforce the rules about numbers of questions asked, and no one to interrupt long, combative exchanges that served no function but to embarrass both parties; there should be more decorum at such events.

Faculty

Excellent communicator, while sometimes testy, can work an audience

This candidate is fundamentally disqualified from being president of this university. He misconstrues his role as responsible to the state, not the university. A president is a fiduciary for the institution he serves. Our Board of Regents is the fiduciary for the state with the obligation of balancing the interests of all three universities. It does that best when the president of each university vigorously represents his/her own institution. The candidate evidences little understanding of the role of academic freedom and tenure in a university wide system. The candidate was not completely forthright in his explanations relating to his past corporate dealings at Boston Chicken (Market) relating to suits involving insider trading as well as his current LLC.

Faculty	I am unsure how I feel about this candidate. He would be a risk- which might be good for the University.	His lack of experience in higher ed.	I was very concerned by the lack of respect and the amount of angry expressed by the audience. The audience is clearly furious at the Board of Regents and should not have directed that at this candidate.
Faculty	Business knowledge, articulate, clear about his ideas, warm personality	CV presented presented false information and transparency is the UI # 1 priority. He does not understand how a university functions, his research in preparation for the interview was very poor (Wikipedia) He gave a good presentation but he failed terribly during the QA. For the tone of QA and general comments I heard, he will not succeed as the next president and if he is chosen, tension between the Board and the university community will be aggravated as never before.	I was very disappointed about his demeanor with students.
Faculty	I think this candidate has knowledge about budget efficiency and cutting, something that is probably appealing to the board of regents.	This candidate clearly does not understand academia. Most of his rhetoric sounded like he was running a corporation and was trying to create profit. Although I understand that is his background, universities are not for profit institutions, it is completely different. He discussed how being the best can make you rigid and lead to failure. Although this may be the case in the business world, this is not true in academia. The best institutions do not face the same challenges, they are sought after by students and maintain their reputation of excellence. In addition, without an academic background, I think it would be difficult to make decisions about academic issues. There are too many red flags with this candidate that makes me worry about the future of UI if he were our leader.	I have a two-letter plan for hiring Harreid: N-O.
Faculty	His ideas for experimentation are interesting, but underdeveloped.	A business model for a university is inappropriate. He did not have clear responses for any of the questions, often devolving into empty phrases without any real meaning and providing vague, non-specific examples. His responses were often dismissive and ineffective. For someone with business experience, he could not specify clear policies he has enacted, or would plan to enact, for the key working issues faced within universities. His responses to the student questions were extremely insensitive to racial issues, and likely offensive to the students. He has no place as President of this university.	

Faculty	Believes he can make U Iowa a better place. Claims success in other contexts.	Assumed his corporate consulting experience would translate to university setting with ease. Although stated support for shared governance, equated it with asking employees to use social media to submit ideas for institution improvement.	OK--great- to seriously consider an out-of-the box candidate, but this one? Sorry there wasn't someone more interesting, creative, thoughtful, and informed in the mix.
Faculty	Harreld was very enthusiastic. He emphasized the importance of research and teaching. He was very respectful of concerns that people had about whether his qualifications and background equipped him to be a candidate for the position of President of the University of Iowa.	<p>It is extremely disconcerting that Harreld would see himself as steward of all three universities. He compared his relationship with the three Iowa public universities to his relationship with his daughters, and he said that in the same way that he would not give all the same support to all three daughters (because they might need different things at different times), he would allow UI to have its funding cut in some cases, if it helped the other universities. But Harreld is not under consideration to be President of all three universities, but just President of UI. This might have been a slip, if Harreld is seeing himself as basically one of the Iowa Regents. Also, it goes without saying that the President of the University of Iowa would work tirelessly to support the research and teaching mission of the University of Iowa. This was alarming. Harreld did not know what Title IX is. I am very concerned about what else he does not know, if he does not know that, which for anyone in education is gimme. I would invite Harreld to get a position as an Associate Dean somewhere and then move up the ladder, and then apply for a job as UI President in another ten years. He has business experience that might be an asset in running a university, but there are a number of prerequisites for being President of a major research university - a distinguished record of experience in research, teaching, management, and university administration. Harreld fails to meet three of these. I do not know why he wants his first foray into university administration to be as President of a leading research university, and why he does not want to go through the various stepping stones that would be appropriate for acquiring the relevant experience. His Harvard colleague Paul Marshall said in the Cedar Rapids Gazette that although university administration "would be a new experience for [Harreld], he'd probably be very good at that." I do not see why we would be under any obligation to take all the risk here, given Harreld's lack of experience. For example, I would be concerned (and others should be concerned also) if I were all of a sudden a finalist for CEO of John Deere. (I am a successful department chair and a</p>	

Faculty	None relevant to the scope of this position	Complete lack of knowledge about UI or academic institutions and little evidence that he took any time trying to learn. No real passion for this position. No vision since he does not understand the scope of the position. Unacceptable response to the question about Avon. Was cavalier about forgetting to remove it from his CV. This is an issue of integrity, a central value of academia, UI and the state of Iowa. Apparently did not review and revise his CV before sending it to the search committee. This shows disrespect for the position, the process, and Iowa. He does not really seem to want this job or know what it entails. He has no experience with a large medical facility or with athletics.	He would be an embarrassment to the UI and the state of Iowa. He has absolutely no credentials for a job as important as President of UI. He would not bring credit to the UI or the state. And he would not stay long.
---------	---	--	---

Faculty	I'm afraid it's hard to discern any when considering him for the position for which he has interviewed.	At root, there is one. He is not qualified, by education, experience, or other credentials, for this position. The résumé offered as a testimony to his experience is, frankly, inadequate to the role for which he has been considered. His remarks in the public forum were overly general, uninformed, incorrect, and not a means of demonstrating his understanding of the significant responsibilities associated with the role of university president. His handling of the Q&A session was uneven at best, and he failed to demonstrate either knowledge of the institution or the interpersonal skills to manage a difficult situation. If he is of the mind to say, "You know this better than I do" about higher education issues to a doctoral student, he is simply not qualified to do this job. In fact, the lack of knowledge demonstrated in the public segments of this interview are more like a case study of what not to do in a job interview. Further, his apparent falsification of his credentials -- as discussed in this news story http://www.thegazette.com/subject/news/education/higher-education/fourth-university-of-iowa-presidential-candidate-bruce-harrelid-20150831 and in the Q&A following his talk -- indicate that his candidacy should be invalidated. In higher education and private industry alike -- where I worked before becoming faculty -- this sort of dishonesty disqualifies individuals from employment.	While I know how much time and energy a faculty search takes, it is difficult not to see this candidate's ability to advance in the search pool as an indication of real problems. If it is not a poor reflection on the work of the search firm and the search committee, it is a sign that this university's reputation needs repair, if someone with so little knowledge, interest, and aptitude is a finalist for a position of public trust at this institution.
---------	---	---	---

Faculty		Incomplete understanding of the facets, function, and mission of a public research institution. previous experience does not translate. didn't know even the fiscal landscape, which should be in the ballpark for an MBA. lack of transparency in fudging credentials. no understanding of the students' struggle for affordability and access. no understanding of the relationship between research and teaching. no understanding of how a budget functions to support many different types of workers (such as TAs, lecturers, tenure-track faculty, staff, clinical, etc.) within our institution. Incomplete understanding of important issues such as online education, recruitment, retention, sexual violence, diversity, rankings, and many other examples. message was poorly crafted and poorly delivered--he only repeated his talking points, which were empty. unnuanced thinking completely lacking relevant experience	
Faculty	Has had success in the private sector and lectures at Harvard.	I am sincerely not opposed to a non academic becoming president of the University, but I don't believe this candidate is the one. His "vision" statement showed a lack of understanding of the specific aspects of Academia and that lack of understanding was further displayed in the question and answer period. He became flustered with the questions asked of him and then became angry. While I was not pleased with the tone of the questions and sometimes lack of respect of those asking questions, it is not uncommon for academia to ask tough questions, as, unlike corporations, the employees don't feel pressured to necessarily agree with management. I was a bit surprised at his lack of composure and felt it did not bid well for his service as president.	I want to reiterate that I am not opposed to an "out of the box" candidate for president, but I do not believe this is the candidate to do that.
Faculty	Decent public speaker, has four kids, has	is not fit to be a university president. Misrepresented himself on CV. Has no experience as an executive officer in higher education	Do not hire this person
Faculty		-Almost total lack of knowledge, experience, even familiarity with the most important aspects of an institution of higher education -if hired, would immediately create an atmosphere of conflict between the president's office and other university stakeholders. Faculty and staff, in particular, could be expected to feel disrespected and undervalued.	

Faculty	None - he has absolutely no qualifications to be president of a major research university.	He has no experience in academia; he claims to know what's good for students, but how can he know that if he doesn't understand how a research university works? He also actually said that he would be happy with less funding for the University: so he is trying to do what the regents want him to do - which is clearly not in the best interests of the university of Iowa - because they are the ones who hire him.	He misrepresented himself on his CV; simply because of that, he should withdraw from the search. He actually said in his interview "he has better things to do." Good!
Faculty	He has rich donor friends.	His public forum was a train wreck. He was ignorant of basic university operating procedure and was arrogant and combative (he got into an argument with an alum attorney). If he was hired, it would be a disaster for the university. Also, his comments on Title IX were awful.	He is completely unqualified to run UI.
Faculty	He seems personable and articulate	Harreld's background is entirely in business and I'm not necessarily impressed with the businesses he has run - Kraft foods is an unethical company that has close ties to the tobacco companies. Some of his history as published in the gazette is highly troubling and sounds like he isn't very well vetted. His talk was designed to sound collaborative but he didn't actually provide evidence that he has been collaborative in previous leadership in the past. Lots of buzz words but not a lot of content. He was highly flattering during the talk but didn't not actually seem to be aware of the tensions on campus between humanities and sciences or between CLAS and the med school. Being an adjunct while having well-paid job is hardly an experience that allows him to understand and support the roles of faculty as teachers or even the role of lecturers/adjuncts for whom this is the primary job. He has a focus on change/transformation without describing what needs to change or be transformed. Things like the focus on "we raised our tuition" (we have the lowest tuition in the Big 10) without understanding that tuition goes up in response to lower support from the legislature rather than in response to salaries (we have among the lowest salaries in the Big 10); Similar issues seem to be responsive to pop culture understandings of universities without real attention to how these are playing out in day to day universities. "country club colleges" (as discussed on NPR this morning), "collecting credits" and "EdX" models. I was nonplussed with his responses to the questions about basic science and open academic inquiry. The questions raised about his business background are deeply concerning given his interest in transparency	He was in touch with the budget roll out which was encouraging and sounded like he would defend the U of IA -- I am highly distrustful of this... Say the right things and get hired and then he can do whatever he'd like.

Faculty	None. None. The public forum was an embarrassment. He looked bad, and our community looked bad responding to him. This was a trainwreck.	He is not ready to lead a public institution. He reacted very poorly to critical questions. He showed a tremendous lack of understanding about what a public university is and how it functions, and he seemed unable to respond to questions to which he didn't know the answer with a candid "I don't know". (To his credit, he "was" candid about learning about the University by looking it up on Wikipedia.) The top line of his resume was a falsehood. This was a thoroughly undercooked candidacy.	Please don't hire him. PLEASE.
Faculty	I am genuinely shocked that the search committee allowed this candidate to get through. He LIED on his resume about his career. That should have stopped the process right there. He started off well in his public presentation and then began to ramble and repeat himself. He was unable to answer even the simplest questions of students, alumni, and faculty. I am genuinely puzzled why he was invited to the first round of interviews, much less campus. I can imagine non traditional candidates, but he was simply a weak candidate.	I cannot understand why we were presented with four white men, one of whom didn't even meet basic qualifications. This search was rushed, members of the search committee reported feeling intimidated, diversity was apparently a low priority, and the process was clumsy and then actually collapsed. I was shocked that candidates were left to their own devices for dinner--which made the university look absolutely gauche. The "everyone must have equal treatment" simply doesn't hold up to basic human courtesy. I hope the search firm has learned a lot from the many mistakes made in this search.	
Faculty	A success in the business world.	Has very little knowledge of an R-1 public university; didn't demonstrate how his business skills would transfer to academia; didn't show evidence of likelihood he'd be an effective fund-raiser; didn't seem prepared for addressing issues raised by students, in particular.	Not a viable candidate.
Faculty		His experience transforming business organizations does not readily transfer to universities. It is alarming that he has no experience in upper academic administration, and little experience in teaching. He showed lack of real understanding of the crucial relationship between tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance. He did not demonstrate competence in articulating a vision for the university or as an advocate for students, faculty, and the liberal arts as well as sciences and medicine	He seemed out of his element at the Forum--not a good sign for our next UI President.

<p>Faculty</p>	<p>Mr. Harreld has a wealth of experience in the corporate world and in making companies profitable. He probably would make a useful consultant to our next president.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, he provided very little evidence that he had the experiences and the personal qualities that would make him qualified to be president of the university.</p>	<p>Mr. Harreld is not qualified to be president of the university. I cannot imagine a reason for the Regents to take such a risk. Mr. Harreld simply does not understand major academic institutions. He was very loose with the facts in his presentation, many of which were simply wrong. He seems intent on bringing a business model to the university, which may please some of our constituencies but it will not lead to strong university. I suspect that we will become a joke among our AAU peers if he is appointed.</p>
<p>Faculty</p>	<p>Remarks: Understands the major headwinds facing the "academy". Understands the underlying components of successful change. Actually is willing and able to collaborate (has a history of it according to his remarks). Shares some of my own personal views on improving teaching and research through better "engagement" (and how to implement). Recognized the nature of not just UI but all excellent orgs to sow the seeds of their own destruction (rigidity to principles that mattered in the past but not to a new world that just experienced a shock). Q&A: Under fire, handled himself reasonably well in light of the fact that he is probably not used to arguing with academics. In my view, he actually answered the question about sexual harassment better than the other 3 candidates.</p>	<p>Remarks: Like two of the other three candidates, seemed to rush through a couple of his ideas in an effort to remember them. (Only the Tulane Provost had patience and a fine hand at leading an audience to a conclusion). Q&A: lost his patience a bit towards the end, but to be honest, I was impressed at how long he lasted in that situation. Whiffed on the question about "any circumstances when he would support cutting funds to the UI to support the other two Regents universities." Why do I say "whiff"? Because he should/would have known about our history with that scenario and he could have been more specific (said "conditional on the current environment, no"). Instead he hid behind generalities ("sure, there might be a circumstance when he would say yes"). That appeared to me to be a bone thrown to the Regents.</p>	<p>I wish to comment on the overall meeting. As a member of the faculty of the UI, I am embarrassed by some of our community's behavior - it was reprehensible. Too often were questions posed in a more than aggressive style, then answers were ignored, he was almost never thanked for answering or for presenting his views, and some were downright insulting of him directly. As the candidate noted, one of the reasons we believe in the import of the humanities is that we are training future contributing citizens of the world. WHAT EXAMPLE DID WE JUST GIVE OUR STUDENTS? Overall, even if I thought Mr. Harreld could be the President that leads us through a difficult next generation of change in the "academy", those hopes were lost tonight. Given the climate I observed in the room, I don't think there is any chance he could create buy-in for the necessary changes. I am sorry to say that.</p>

Faculty	<p>I listened to Bruce Harreld's entire talk today and the follow up questions. I do not feel that he understands very much about how a university works and knows very little about the University of Iowa. He did not present any vision for the university other than he thought he could make the University better. However, he did not show that he understood what was wrong with the university or what he would fix. I did not think he was able to answer any of the questions very well. He was not able to articulate what he would start doing to make the University of Iowa better besides gathering input from people at the university. I honestly did not hear a single strength that Bruce Harreld would bring to the University of Iowa from his talk and follow up questions. Bruce Harreld's lack of experience was clear since he could not even answer straight forward questions.</p>	<p>Bruce Harreld demonstrated in his talk and the follow up questions that he would not advocate for the University of Iowa with the Regents. He said that he was not opposed to reallocation of funds from the University of Iowa to Iowa State and Northern Iowa. He did not give me the impression that he would fight for funding for the University of Iowa. He did not seem like he could intelligently explain the economic impact that the University of Iowa has on the state of Iowa. Bruce Harreld could not articulate a vision for the University of Iowa. Bruce Harreld could not articulate why the University of Iowa is a great university and its economic impact on the state. Bruce Harreld did a very poor job answering questions tonight. It is clear that Bruce Harreld has not thought about common issues that a University President will have to deal with on a daily basis. Bruce Harreld was confrontational with some of his answers tonight. Bruce Harreld did not present himself tonight very presidential. In my opinion, I think Bruce Harreld will have a very hard time getting the support of the faculty, staff and students at the University of Iowa. Bruce Harreld is not someone that will inspire me to follow his lead from what I have heard from him so far.</p>
Faculty	smooth talker	<p>He spoke in vague generalities rather than being specific about issues. My least favorite candidate. he did not really answer many of the questions he was asked, many of his comments could have been for any university and he seemed uninformed about Iowa. I felt like I was watching a late-night motivational speaker during an NPR fund raiser week rather than a candidate for a university president.</p>

Faculty	None.	<p>It was painfully obvious that he did not belong. He showed no understanding of Title IX, no appreciation for what a Liberal Arts Education, did not know basic aspects of the life of a Professor, or the role of students, even. He is used to running the show in a culture in which he can fire people at will. I almost felt badly for him. He has no skills to manage a University institution and its speaks volumes about the utter cluelessness of the Regents if they believed that he could. Disgraceful.</p>	<p>Which one of the following things did UI Presidential Bruce Harreid say or do: A) Argued that he would support a transfer of millions of dollars from the University of Iowa to other state universities B) In response to a question about Title IX and sexual assault on campuses, he said: "I don't know that I have a great answer about your Title IX but let me talk about the bigger issue" C) "I told this to President Calderon: the time you start inadvertently killing your own citizens, you now have a lot of heat here" (in reference to the killing of 120,000 Mexicans as part of Calderon's Mexican Drug War policies) D) In response to a staff member's question about a policy he implemented that helped the staff and promoted a climate of inclusion, he said: "I don't know that I have any. Now what?" E) All of the above. Correct answer is E. Do I honestly need to say anything more? What a joke.</p>
Faculty		<p>Not qualified to be president of a major public university. It would be an embarrassment to the University of Iowa, its employees, and its alumni if he were selected. The holes and inaccuracies in his cv should automatically disqualify him.</p>	<p>How in the world did this guy make it into the final pool of candidates?</p>
Faculty	<p>His strengths are in the private sector--this is where he has experience--not in higher education</p>	<p>He has no experience in higher education administration. This seems to be a basic requirement for the job. It is not clear why this person was acceptable to the committee as he clearly lacks the necessary experience for the job.</p>	<p>Overall, he believes that his ability to turn around organizations can be applied to university. I do not accept the implication that the university needs to be turned around. The Board of Regents may think this way, but they are wrong. In general, I think the Board of Regents decision to release plans to request no new funds for the UI demonstrates that the Board is playing favorites--picking winners and losers. Moreover, the timing of the release of this information in the midst of the UI presidential search seems designed to add insult to injury--to embarrass the University in this very public moment. Shame on the Board of Regents.</p>
Faculty	None.	Lack of Experience. Lack of Credentials.	

Faculty	He seems to have done a good job with Boston Chicken, though the strong record he claims with IBM is disputed by many; for someone who represents himself on his business record, it appears quite weak. And that's not to mention the lawsuit on insider trading.	There are many red flags with J. Bruce Harrell's candidacy for UI President. First and foremost, in the campus open house, he showed absolutely no conception of the nature and importance of research in the sciences, humanities, or medicine. His background is entirely business, with the exception of several adjunct positions at business schools, and he has absolutely no experience in university administration; this inexperience, combined with lack of vision - except for perhaps making broad, uninformed cuts based on the regents' suggestions - would make him exceptionally dangerous for the health of our university. Moreover, he showed no conception that the primary mission of a university is to educate students, not to maximize profits, as in a corporation. It is not in the best interest of the people of Iowa to reduce the quality of education at the University of Iowa through a focus on distance and online education. We're not comparable to a community college because our mission is different.	Another major issue is what appears to be misrepresentation on his CV, as reported in the August 31 article of the Gazette. This is enough to warrant the withdrawal of the application - and admitting its "shame on me" is not an acceptance of personal responsibility; he should simply remove himself from the search. This is another problem with the fast pace of the search - it appears intended to prevent basic vetting of the candidate's qualifications by the university community.
Faculty	He appears confident.	Aside from this candidate's alarming lack of preparation or understanding about what actually goes on at a major public research institution, Mr. Harrell's marked contempt and dismissive, patronizing demeanor towards the two questioners who were young women of color was disgraceful. As he repeatedly remarked during that painful Q&A session, shame on him!	I cannot comprehend why the Regents wasted resources bringing this unqualified candidate to campus. It is an embarrassment. Quoting the candidate, SHAME ON YOU.
Faculty		Despite a few good aspects, Mr. Harrell's presentation and answers to questions were overall very poor. His presentation was largely a re-hash of Jim Collins' 2001 book "Good to Great". Mr. Harrell did very little homework on this university, or on the complex issues facing higher education today, and it showed. For example, about sexual violence on campus, he had little knowledge of Title IX; his research consisted of asking his adult daughter what she remembered from her years at Pomona. This was just one of many questions that he flubbed. I think it is possible that a leader from business could be a leader of a university. But Mr. Harrell is not that person. His further candidacy should be rejected.	The search produced three superbly talented candidates (Krislov, Bernstein, Steinmetz). Any one of the three would be an excellent president of Iowa. The fourth candidate (Harrell) was worth bringing to campus for interview, but the interview went poorly. I strongly encourage the Regents to pick one of the first three candidates.

Faculty	Business analysis (self-proclaimed mostly). One would have expected more cogent discussion of US tertiary education, if not specific examples from the University of Iowa. Disappointing.	Did not do his homework. May have padded his resume. Could give neither a concise analysis challenges to universities nor to questions from the audience.	Apparently he's never been a CEO, much less have any education administration experience. Even if he were brilliant the extended learning curve required to make him marginally competent disqualifies his candidacy: not qualified for the presidency.
Faculty	I appreciated his openness and amiability, and he seems to have had a successful corporate career (although there is very little in the public record to judge by).	Has almost no experience with academia aside from some adjunct teaching at an elite business school and no experience whatsoever in university administration. Showed no understanding during the campus visit of what an R-1 school does, the challenges it faces, or the many constituents it serves. In fact, had inaccurate assumptions on nearly every issue he addressed. Unlikely to win the trust of the UI community or to represent us well. Surprisingly, also showed little sense of the importance of fund-raising as part of a president's job.	Not qualified for the job. Would be an unacceptable choice.
Faculty	Friendly Surprisingly, Mr. Harreld seems to have the right priorities for the University of Iowa, speaking repeatedly about protecting "the core" (teaching and research). He has a strong experience in organizational change; I'm not sure I always understood his rhetoric on this (and faculty and students might not either, which could be a barrier), but it does seem like he offers some fresh thinking and the ability to get things done. He also expressed a strong preference for consensus building and I tend to take him at face value on this.	Not qualified for the position He spent a great deal of time in his talk "diagnosing" the problems we face. Unfortunately, I think he got the diagnosis wrong; and he did not display great understanding of the challenges faced by the University of Iowa or of higher education in general. He seemed to not understand many basic properties of how universities work and seemed fairly ill prepared for this interview. While he vowed strong independence from the board of regents, his answer to the question of whether he would support a transfer of funds from UI to ISU and UNI suggested that might not be the case. Overall, he did not seem to exude the managerial competence of either of the other candidates. And he was never pushed on things that are perhaps much more technically difficult as a manager -- like managing an academic medical center. His only answer seemed to be to invest more in particular initiatives; while the initiative sounded good, it seemed Pollyannish to think we would be able to get the money to do this.	Not prepared to be president of a university
Faculty	None	No experience in University administration. Vision for University significantly different to that shared by an overwhelming majority of the faculty. Did not seem to have a strong commitment to the full mission of the University.	He is not qualified.

Faculty	polished speaker, experience in making businesses profitable	lacks scholarly credentials; language of innovation, leadership, etc reflects corporate values more than non-profit pursuit of knowledge in service of the public good. Quick on his feet but irritated when challenged by predictable (naïve) questions; too hierarchical. Even if possibly would bring some strengths, lack of academic credentials and academic administrative experience would make it hard for him to win respect of faculty, students, staff, alumni, etc. The confusion around his current employment was also disconcerting.	Of the four finalists, this was the only one I found unqualified for the position.
Faculty	absolutely none for this position	horrible town hall -- knew shockingly little about UI or higher education in general; condescending; very poorly prepared; non-responsive to most questions completely unqualified to be president of UI or any other educational institution	
Faculty	Has strengths as a consultant but not as a president of a major Research 1 University.	With no academic administrative experience does not have qualifications for this position, will not be a successful president to lead UI. Did not do well answering questions at forum.	Too many negatives to be a successful president. Will not have faculty and student support.
Faculty	Few that I saw. Even the expected "strength"--an ability to apply a business model of organizational management--seemed absent, since he seemed anxious to disavow that he would apply business strategies to the university.	Oddly incoherent and bumbling statements in his presentation.	This candidate makes sense as a university president about as much as a university president would make sense as CEO of a major corporation.

Faculty	He seems like an affable person.	<p>Bruce Harreld is woefully ignorant about higher education; not only does he not know anything about the contemporary university environment, but he is dangerously misinformed. He has no direct experience with the research, teaching, or service missions of the university. Teaching as an adjunct in an elite MBA program is not the same as working with undergraduates, TAs, and first-generation/rural students. In the public forum, his answers were simplistic and vague. He was unable to articulate the connections among tenure, academic freedom, and shared governance -- issues crucial to the faculty. He did not know that universities are liable for sexual assault under Title IX (and this is the kind of question a reporter might ask a university president out of the blue, without lawyers around). He oversimplified this issue by declaring he would not allow sexual assault to happen on campus, immediately expelling alleged perpetrators -- with no sense of due process or survivors' hesitance to file claims. Sexual assault is a complex issue; he had no notion of its complexities. He said he would support health sciences research, but fund only teaching in the liberal arts, demonstrating a complete disdain for scholarship in the arts and humanities -- which is one of the University of Iowa's great strengths! We would not have won all those Pulitzer Prizes in writing if our faculty were only teaching. He piled research against teaching, not recognizing that at a research university like this one, research informs teaching: college teaching is energized and advanced by faculty research. He said he had no experience with staff, and that at IBM he had initiated no programs aimed at empowering, motivating, or diversifying the workforce. (I found this shocking and alarming.) He is absolutely unqualified for this job.</p>	<p>If Bruce Harreld is appointed president, the campus will be violently divided. There will be an extremely negative reaction from many staff members, faculty, and students. It could lead to a great deal of negative media coverage for the University of Iowa, as well as a great deal of dissent and unhappiness on campus. We have three alternative candidates with sterling credentials. A great deal of misery and public discord could be avoided if Harreld is not selected.</p>
Faculty	<p>I feel he did pretty well under the circumstances. It may well be that we need business specialists free of significant academic backgrounds at the upper levels of the administration at the UI in due course but right now is too soon in my view.</p>	<p>Lack of administrative academic background.</p>	<p>Thank you for soliciting comments from everyone and considering them in your recommendations to the BoR</p>
Faculty	<p>At least he didn't fall off of the platform.</p>	<p>He is in no way qualified to serve as president of any university. He demonstrated that in person today.</p>	<p>Rastetter has dishonored Harreld by putting him in this position. The search committee was stacked with pro-business members. If the BoR wants to install this fraud as president, the divisions are going to be sharp and permanent within the university between Business and the Med Complex, on the one hand, and CLAS on the other. And the ruin of the University will have happened on Rastetter's watch.</p>

Faculty	None, other than being subservient to the Regents.	The candidate is in no way qualified to be president of the University of Iowa. His knowledge of higher education is no deeper than the Wikipedia article he read on Iowa before he came here. He was crass, interrupted stakeholders who came to ask him questions, and used profanity on a live stream for the world to hear! It was deeply embarrassing. If he managed to alienate students, alumni, and faculty in an hour and a half, he is in no way prepared to handle sensitive or controversial issues. Also, it appears he lied on his CV. Did the search firm NOT CHECK his credentials? Did he really work at Harvard?	There are 3 other qualified candidates. Harreid would cause damage to our state, national and international reputation. He already has. Parker, we deserve a refund, as this candidate was a waste of our time and money.
Faculty	None. Demonstrated not simply ignorance about University and UJA issues and needs, but actually offered misinformation. Incorrect and misleading info on cv would be grounds for punitive action if he was a faculty member.	Seemed willfully ignorant about the University. Does not have any familiarity with basic definitions of academic freedom, tenure, or shared governance (as evidenced by his failure to respond to direct questions); apparently does not know there is research coming from the arts and humanities faculty; failed to understand how staff fit into the University mission; would alienate parents and alumni. Spoke over and interrupted students attempting to ask questions--lacked basic courtesy. Admitted ignorance of University initiatives around teaching innovations (collaborative, student-centered teaching, for example, or work in Tlie classrooms, or the "big question" courses that have proven so popular. Would make UJA a CJC laughingstock and drive away students and donors.	Failed to specifically address how his business experience would relate to his ability to work with the University community and improve the University--this was up to him to accomplish in his talk and in open forum, and he failed to meet the task.
Faculty	He would be a good consultant to raise interesting questions and suggest options.	He is not qualified to be president. He will not have the respect or support of the faculty.	we would not hire a custodian who makes false statements on his resume, let alone a president.
Faculty		Harreid is utterly unqualified to assume the presidency of our university or any other. He knows next to nothing about the academy. His selection by the Board of Regents would be an insult to the students, staff, and faculty of The University of Iowa. "Shame on us" if he were chosen.	

Faculty	Impressive credentials in the business world. The converse is a lack of experience in academia (next field).	The main weakness is a lack of direct experience in higher education administration. Much of the forum was business-speak that did not contain specifics regarding how he would lead the University of Iowa forward to address some of the "headwinds" he identified. Most comparisons were to models and other institutions (e.g., for-profit colleges) that are not appropriate for comparison to Iowa. His focus on teaching and mentoring students as an indicator of success (based on a recent Gallup poll) seemed naive in its assumption that we simply need more faculty in the classroom. Students are trained and mentored at many levels, including in the research lab.	Of the four candidates, Mr. Harreld did not meet threshold for the position. Beyond a lack of relevant experience, I did not hear any specific plans that would benefit the University of Iowa. I suspect that he would have a significant challenge understanding not only the major issues facing higher education institutions, but also the concerns facing faculty, staff, and students.
Faculty	Smooth talker	No experience in higher education administration. His "building the core" seems to be code for cutting "non-core" (i.e., smaller) programs. Doesn't seem to know much about the UI or higher education in general. Didn't directly answer several questions posed to him at the forum. No much of an academic record. Didn't demonstrate much commitment to diversity or the arts/humanities. Pretty vague overall. Mentioned that his experience is building up struggling enterprises - is the UI really struggling? (I don't think so). The answer to the "performance based funding model" question was troubling.	Why? Why is he a candidate and why on earth would the board hire him?
Faculty	Truly understands organizational structure and change management, which are important needs for our next president. Spoke passionately about focusing resources on our core mission, teaching and research.	Clearly lacks an understanding of academic culture. Will not be able to overcome negative perceptions of him on campus.	I was pleasantly surprised by this candidate. I expected him to be completely unsuited to the position. In spite of my preconceptions, I found many of his ideas to be compelling. I am embarrassed by how he was treated. Our community was rude and unwelcoming. I am ashamed by the behavior of some of my colleagues. Nevertheless, their behavior is evidence that he will never be able to overcome their negativity about him regardless of what he says or does. As a result, choosing this candidate would only set him up for failure as he would never have the support of the campus community.

Faculty	<p>This is not totally clear to me. It's possible he has connections in business that could be beneficial for the University. I appreciate that he stated an openness to learning about the University's needs and challenges, but I am unclear why he appears to be so poorly informed about the University's operations and priorities if he really wants the job.</p>	<p>I am very concerned about his candidacy. Based on his performance at the forum today, I am not convinced he could effectively communicate with, listen to, and engage with the students, faculty, staff, or public. I saw little evidence of poise and clarity in the face of challenging questions, which he would need for articulating the University's concerns and strengths to the public and the press, and in dealing with controversial issues. I did not see evidence of how he would be able to build trust with the various members of the University community. I am deeply concerned about the state of the University should he be appointed, and the possibility of mass exodus of our most talented faculty and staff, which would not only gut the University's ability to achieve its scholarly, teaching, and mentoring missions, but also incur major financial problems in the form of lost grant dollars. This is not a knee-jerk reaction to someone from the business world, but rather a reaction to the candidate's poor performance today and his clear lack of understanding about how the University works and how to communicate with its constituents.</p>	<p>I'm not convinced the candidate understands fundamental aspects of the University and its priorities - for example, he appeared not to know what title IX is, came off as inarticulate and poorly informed about sexual assault and fostering diversity on campus, could not explain what tenure is or its current role in the University, and could not clearly articulate the most pressing problem students are facing today. He could very well be a walking public relations disaster for the University and the state of Iowa.</p>
Faculty	<p>His forum was a train wreck. He apparently did not try to familiarize himself with the UI before coming here because he said nothing of substance about the UI. He spoke off the cuff during his opening remarks which was a huge mistake. He essentially didn't know anything meaningful about Iowa or higher education.</p>	<p>He is unacceptable as a presidential candidate.</p>	
Faculty	<p>Intelligent and personable</p>	<p>lacks relevant experience; doesn't really articulate practical plans for achieving goals</p>	<p>Ultimately unacceptable. His appointment will aggravate already problematic relations between faculty and the board of regents. The other three candidates are very strong.</p>

Faculty	none	Lied on his CV about the company he supposedly directs. lack of integrity and honesty. Could not answer simple questions. Vague distorts information for his own points (eg. what he said about Maslow was totally wrong). total lack of understanding about what are the important things that make universities operate	Totally unqualified to be a university president. Lied on his cv about the company he directs. it is nonexistent. In 1995, Harreid was listed as a defendant in a lawsuit accusing him and other corporate leaders of insider trading and conflict of interest. That initial lawsuit was dismissed, but plaintiffs persisted and the case eventually settled we dont want someone sued for COI as our university president. no indication of his being innocent, just that the case was settled. Incompetent at answering questions. Gave vague answers. Kept going back to the catchwords of great to greater. Complete paucity of ideas. Unable to answer questions even about his own professional background. Lacks the understanding or knowledge base to be a university president. It is an insult to the university of Iowa to even consider such an individual as president, and were the regents foolish enough to nominate him, we would become the laughingstock of other universities. he appears to make his living flitting from one consulting job to another. the likelihood that he would stay as university president long enough to make a lasting contribution is minimal no chance whatsoever of team building with faculty and staff if the regents really want to see the downfall of the University of Iowa, this is their man.
Faculty	As a University president, none that I could detect.	In both experience and training, he is absolutely unqualified to hold this office. His handling of questions from the University community only confirmed this impression.	Naming Mr. Harreid as a finalist was an insult to the University and to the other three, qualified candidates.
Faculty			After last year's incident with the public statue on campus the last thing this University needs is a president who sticks his foot in his mouth when it comes to minority populations. Unfortunately, this candidate did just that, offending the Black woman who asked him a question by telling her she was part of the "African American community." How did he know she doesn't identify first as a woman? Or rape survivor? Or transgender? Ignorant white folks may think she was too easily offended; unfortunately, that says more about their ignorance than anything else. This guy is a public relations disaster waiting to happen.

Faculty	He has a great vision and correctly has diagnosed the societal views of the problem with higher education. He voiced some exciting ideas at a broad level.	Unable to consistently communicate/articulate that vision to the broader community in this one instance.	
Faculty	I tried, I tried with an open mind. I listened carefully to Mr. Harreid's impromptu meandering of a vision for Iowa. I tried to see his perspective when listening and responding to the questions. I am sad and disappointed that he was brought in for a job that he is not qualified for.	zero applicable knowledge of academic institutions	In 90 minutes, the number of times he said "I don't know" and "I am not going to get caught in that trap" was nauseating. I am exceptionally frustrated that the Board of Regents brought Mr. Harreid in. Truly - in a national wide search - by a firm that is getting paid \$200,000 of Iowa Tax Dollars - Mr. Harreid made the TOP FOUR? Moreover, the top four were four old white guys. Where is the gender equality nor ethnicity mixing. Shame on the Board of Regents, shame on Iowa.
Faculty	It is difficult to identify any strengths associated with this candidate. He seems to have good experience in business and strategy. However, it is unclear how his experience in business has prepared him to oversee a complex academic institution.	Outside of his lack of experience, he is a poor communicator. His vision was poorly articulated, non-specific, and reflects a lack of understanding of the basic functions and services provided by a large, public institution. I do not understand why this candidate was selected and believe he is extremely unprepared for the challenges that he would encounter if he would become the President of the University of Iowa. The contrast between his vision and the vision of any other candidates is striking and it would be a tremendous setback to the mission of this institution if this candidate selected.	
Faculty		Doesn't have the experience in the field that would make him a successful president. Good for a management consultant, but not for president.	
Faculty	Outstanding candidate that can take the University of Iowa to the next level in teaching and scholarship.	None	
Faculty	I strongly support Bruce Harreid. He is the one candidate who is exciting and has a vision to move us forward rather than to simply keep the trains running on time.		Please do not let the old guard faculty dictate who our next President can be.
Faculty	None		Not qualified for the position! His two-page CV could probably get him a lecturer position in the College of Business. His modest CV contains inconsistencies, revealed by an article on the Cedar Rapids Gazette. He could work as a consultant, but the job of president is too big for him.

Faculty	None	No higher education administrative experience No research background No experience whatsoever at a public university Minimal background in dealing with students No fundraising experience No indicated support or experience with the arts, humanities or professions No indication of knowledge of health care issues Sloppy CV - several typos; does his company even exist?? Lots of concerns about his CV	I don't see how this person is even remotely qualified to be a university president, and I don't see how faculty, staff or students will support him
Faculty	I truly can't think of any. I am not sure why this candidate has been invited to campus. He has no relevant experience in academia, and to the best of my knowledge no other relevant experiences that can counted as possible substitutes for the lack of actual relevant experience.	This candidate belongs in the corporate world, and while it seems obvious that he has advanced there, I am not sure why one would think those skills would be so relevant for a university president as to even come close to making up all the serious deficiencies in experience of this candidate.	I am passionate about our first candidate (marvin krislov), but I also believe that the presidential search committee did by and large an amazing job and I would, for one, be very happy with any of the finalists for this job other than this candidate.
Faculty	I'm guessing several Regents think he would be wonderful.	No experience in similar position. Would come here with zero faculty support. His cv suggests experience in leading-by-command, not leading-by-inspiring, which is what is needed to keep and increase our strengths.	I am a Professor Emeritus, still active in research. This candidate looks like an off-the-wall gamble, perhaps hand-picked by the Regents. I can't imagine that faculty on the Search Committee supported his candidacy. He may be a great business leader, and a really nice guy. But he is totally wrong for this University. Sidebar: Someone blacked out items a the top of his cv, yet left his religious affiliation at the end. Surely a candidate's religion should NOT be part of his professional cv. It speaks ill of the candidate for him to include it, and speaks ill of whoever edited it for distribution.
Faculty		Bruce Harreld advertises, as perhaps his greatest achievement, his work with IBM. I am not impressed. IBM (not unlike HP) remains today a ghost of its former presence in the computer industry. Do we want to make the University of Iowa a ghost of its former presence in the academic world?	Bruce Harreld would, if hired, gain close to zero respect from the University Community. He is decidedly the oddball candidate in the field of four.
Faculty		Typo on his resume? Led BM's instead of IBM's unit	
Faculty	None. How can this person even be a candidate? His academic credentials are non-existent, he pales in comparison to the others.	No experience in academic administration, no research credentials. He is clearly just supposed to come in and make cuts.	It's horrible that he's even a candidate, truly appalling.
Faculty		No academic credentials.	This person has very little experience in academia-- what will he do for students? How will he engage with our educational goals??

Faculty	Business experience - would make a good corporate CEO; university president - not so much	Minimal academic experience, and no true academic publications. No administrative experience in higher education. No fundraising experience. No mention of the arts and sciences (or professional programs). Overall, too narrowly focused in the business world and lacks the breadth of experience to lead a comprehensive university.	Not qualified to be President of the University of Iowa!
Faculty	<p>The fourth candidate is woefully unqualified to be president of our university. He did not demonstrate in the open discussion that his skills in the arena of business would translate into effective leadership of a large and complex institution of higher learning and professional education. Though the regents may wish to have a different sort of voice leading the institution, there is no evidence that this candidate would be a reasonable choice. The onus is on the regents and on the candidate to make the case for this individual and that case has not been made. He did not seem to understand the organizational structure of a large public university. He did not seem to understand the role of tenure at universities. He did not seem to understand the impact of Title IX and the protections it offers to certain constituencies. He did not seem to have a basic appreciation for inquiry and creativity that are at the heart of any institution of higher learning. If one of the principal functions of the president is to explain the value of the work of the institution in order to solicit funds and demonstrate our importance to the state and its economy, the last candidate showed no skills or aptitude in that area. In fact, he seemed to approach the work of university teaching and learning with a degree of scorn and disrespect that was astonishing. If this candidate has promised the regents and the students that he'll use his business skills to trim the university budget and offer a lower-cost education, I can only imagine that the result will be an impoverished experience for the students. I believe in the value of higher education for our students and our society. I want to feel that the next president of this university has the same belief and will bring creativity and energy to our campus. The first three candidates all demonstrated the necessary experience, enthusiasm, and energy to be effective in the position of president. But, to be frank, being an adjunct instructor at the Harvard Business School is simply no preparation for running the University of Iowa.</p>		
Other	Unique ideas to move us forward	Very steep learning curve	I am embarrassed by the behavior of our university. We were not Iowa nice.
Other	Very little at best to for this position and no experience being part of running a school.	Errors on resume, poor public speaking, experience poor, insider trading inquiry, seemingly no interest in job or success of school, terrible response to questions in forum, not sure even how or why he was a candidate in the first place and think he would make poor president	Seems like the head of regents picked this person before the process started, cut everyone else out and will install this person to run things like he wants which is a very poor and short sighted viewpoint, there will be no where to hide now after this choice

<p>Other</p>	<p>While controversial in certain circles, this candidate brings a set of experiences and analytical perspectives that have potentially great value. Is the UI a business? Not in the traditional sense of the word, but it is in many important respects. The UI competes for market share (students and research dollars), has customers in a loose sense (students, alumni, sponsors, donors, grantors) but also directly in that people/companies/etc buy what we sell. What we sell is ideas along with tangible products, but nevertheless we sell. A person with Mr. Harreld's experiences could bring new perspectives on how to apply lessons learned in a different kind of market to higher education. The key to success, in my view, is his commitment to experimentation coupled with thorough explanation of the purpose and consensus building. An under appreciated element of this candidate's background is the work of moving research through the stages of innovation to commercialized product. As the UI moves more strongly into this arena, his experiences could prove enormously valuable in organizing our efforts with the caveat that he would need to be mindful to the mission of the institution. His commitment at the public forum to the "core" of teaching and research would seem to signal that recognition. As an alumnus and a former volunteer leader for the UI Alumni Association, I am impressed by the potential Harreld holds for deepening the involvement of alumni in educational and career development of Iowa's students. His discussion of the importance of mentoring offers ample opportunity for interested</p>	<p>To be successful Harreld will have to build consensus around a core set of ideas and build confidence in the potential benefits of that course of action - to do so he needs to be articulate and persuasive. Those skills were difficult to display at the public forum.</p>
<p>Other</p>	<p>What I had hoped would be the strengths of bringing in a non traditional candidate (corporate rather than academic) were not realized. I don't believe Mr. Harreld has the perspective needed to run a university.</p>	<p>Much has been made of this candidate's lack of experience working with faculty and students - I can't and won't comment on whether that is a good or bad thing. As an alumnus, I find his candidacy intriguing. Certainly there are risks with pursuing this option, but with a strong management team those risks are potentially very manageable (i.e., a strong advisory/administrative team that can help focus attention to certain areas and away from others). The president is a lobbyist, spokesperson, advocate, fundraiser, and salesman. Harreld has many of those skills.</p>
<p>Other</p>	<p>I was appalled by his comments about the liberal arts (Medical school should do the research, the liberal arts needs to work on teaching). This is not the vision I want for our university.</p>	<p>As an alum of Iowa I worry about how Mr. Harreld would reimagine the school and potentially devalue my degree (which I'm still paying for years later due to student loans). Watching how dismissive he was towards the student questions and under represented constituents. (watch the video) I would hate to see him be the public face of the University of Iowa. The other three candidates had their strengths and weaknesses, ultimately I could be satisfied with any of them.</p>

Other	N/A	Lacks any depth of understanding of the institution. Did little or no preparation for the interview in terms of "homework" and what was done was via questionable sources. His own résumé was poorly prepared and incorrect by his own admission. Showed little or no ability to provide any vision or leadership for this university. In short, an extremely poor candidate.	Being a non-academic is the least of his weaknesses. He showed nothing in his public remarks that suggested he was a good candidate. Someone who cannot correctly prepare or proof their résumé has lost the battle for respect. Add accusations of ethical and financial wrongdoing and it becomes out of the question to be a serious candidate. The search committee did not do their job on this one.
Other	Probably a good understanding of organizational and personnel matters.	1. No serious academic background. 2. No clear articulation of his goals for this University. 3. A poorly organized opening presentation. 4. "Stream of consciousness" style of verbal delivery.	The one article of his that I read ("Six ways to sink a growth initiative", in the Harvard Business Review) was journalistic, not scholarly. Herreid failed to indicate that he is second author of a jointly authored article, an omission that a genuine scholar would never allow.
Other	None for this position	Too many to list. Main one - a complete lack of understanding (clearly evidenced by his public remarks) of a research university. For him to publicly state that he attempted to learn about the university via Wikipedia is appalling. He clearly had done no background and summed up his interest quite clearly - "...a great opportunity for me." His candidacy is an insult to the state. He has no relevant knowledge, no understanding, and apparently no respect for the institution. That he thinks distance education is an "innovation" is a clear indication that he is behind the times. He expressed no vision beyond "maybe I can fix things." I am fairly confident that any "world class talent" that he referenced as desirable would take pains to avoid the institution if he were to be in the presidency at UI. Moreover, current faculty talent would likely begin searching for positions elsewhere.	A non-academic might be able to take on a presidency of a Research 1 flagship university - this candidate cannot. I have followed the presidential searches of all of the state schools for the past 25 years. This candidate is -- by a wide margin -- the poorest candidate I have ever seen for a presidency at any public university in Iowa. I am at a complete loss to understand how he was a finalist - a complete loss. I am embarrassed for the institution and for the state.
Other	Some management experience (seemingly).	Understanding of the importance and contributions of the liberal arts and sciences. This candidate is wholly unprepared to represent and/or execute a broad and inclusive vision for the university. If the candidate's CV is any indication, he is also completely inadequately prepared to head an important research institution like the University of Iowa.	
Other	None	His CV does not match the level of the other three candidates. He is obviously the worst candidate. Does not know how the university functions.	How that CV passed the committee? I heard the students were tricked to vote for this candidate.

Other			As a very proud Iowa alumna, I find it disheartening and baffling that that the Board of Regents is considering a candidate who has not served in any higher ed administrative position. I do not see how a college president can lead a university nor make informed decisions about higher education -- decisions that are in the best interest of the school -- if their experience in higher education is limited to teaching business courses. Iowa is a stellar institution of higher education and ought to be run by someone with the appropriate experience. It is not a business to be managed or "turned around."
Other	After meeting all four candidates my strongest reaction is that Bruce Harreid would be huge misfit with the University of Iowa. He would bring turmoil and institutional unrest that would be unprecedented. His appointment would set back our fine institution for years after he leaves the UI.		I am impressed with all of the other candidates and would list my preference for Joseph Steinmetz from Ohio State first, Michael Bernstein second, and Marvin Krislov third.
Staff		Has no relevant experience to an academic institution.	Puzzled how this candidate made it to the final round.
Staff	Reasonably good speaker (although it wasn't always easy to understand him); strong experience in strategic planning	unfamiliar with higher education in general and the Big Ten and UI in particular; lack of credibility with campus	I don't think he would be the best choice for President but might be an exceptional consultant for us.
Staff		Any candidate who cites Wikipedia in reference to a research university should not be in charge of a research university.	
Staff			While I was disappointed with our rudely our community treated this candidate during the open forum, I don't support Mr. Harreid's candidacy due to his lack of experience in an academic environment and how out of touch he is with important issues facing our students today, as evidenced by some of his answers.
Staff	Managing corporations	No experience with university administration. Poor thesis and vision for the University. Talked around points and questions with out being specific.	

Staff	I appreciated his point that we can do a better job of telling our story of our successes, but it's very clear that he doesn't know what success at an educational institution would look like if he saw it.	He already demonstrated at multiple points that he was in over his head, and that was just during the campus visit. He doesn't seem to understand how educational institutions operate, how quality is identified, who our stakeholders are, what successful institutions do, what challenges we face, what resources we bring, or what it would take for him to establish credibility here. It's also clear that he doesn't have a very good sense of how to demonstrate to would-be adversaries that he will be one of their chief allies in facing a challenging future.	It is difficult to imagine the other 37 candidates that didn't get invited to campus if this one made it to the final four. It really casts doubt on the ability of the search firm to attract credible candidates. If we're really serious about running the university more like a business, we should not start by hiring ill-prepared leaders who have no experience in the higher education sector and such limited understanding of the institution or the job they are being considered for.
Staff	None for this position.	Given many weaknesses - such as inattention to submitting a factually correct CV, lack of evidence of real research into the University of Iowa, quoting Wikipedia as a source of data, a ridiculous belief that UI is on some kind of precipice and could fail any day - I am very surprised that this candidate even bothered to apply to such a position. He seems more like a dabbler than a genuine candidate. In some cases he didn't answer the questions asked, and often did not seem to understand the type of issue that arises at a place like UI. As someone who has worked at UI for nearly two decades, I'm embarrassed that this candidate has been put forward as an actual finalist. Was the field of potential candidates that weak overall?	I feel that Parker should have done due diligence on this candidate's resume. I am also stunned that this candidate made the cut at this level. A large public university is not a corporation and should not be treated as such. There are different goals for nonprofits, and that is reasonable. I don't object to an unusual resume for such a position, but surely there are MBAs out there with far more impressive resumes for taking on this kind of challenge.
Staff	Improving businesses and being a leader.	Direct academic/higher education experience	I want to go on record that I am truly embarrassed to be a Hawkeye this morning after attending the forum last night. Every candidate deserves to be given respect regardless of their experience and the people asking the questions showed no respect. There are ways to ask questions without being aggressive. There is a reason he has made it to the final four candidates and people need to come in with an open mind, listen and ask questions, but ask them with courtesy - he is our guest and 'midwestern nice' was not in attendance.
Staff			This candidate is the least qualified of all 4 candidates. I would be saddened to learn of his hiring.
Staff			Seriously. Out of the 9 semifinalists there was not a better fourth candidate. Absolutely do not appoint him president.

Staff	An overabundance of confidence, swagger.	Does not answer questions, is dismissive of people who try to pin him down (told one professor he was acting like an adolescent), has no real vision.	I have found that when people refuse to answer questions, it is because they do not want me to know what they are thinking and what they intend to do. Mr. Harreld gave non-answer-answers or simply refused to answer (I'm not going to fall into that trap) and spoke in broad generalities. Although he claimed to believe in shared governance, his attitude and demeanor lead me to believe that actual shared governance would not sit well with him. At the end of his forum, I still didn't know why on earth he wants to be the President of the University of Iowa. I don't trust him to have Iowa's best interest in mind. This would simply be another feather in his cap. This man has no business running a university.
Staff		He handled the Q&A very poorly. He did not stay calm under pressure. It is clear faculty will not work well with him and he would be too divisive for progress to be made. He did not appear to have tried to learn much about higher ed (did he even know what Title IX was?) before interviewing.	Do. not. hire. this. man.
Staff	Cares about teaching and mentoring. Experience leading a large and complex organization. Willingness to move quickly from strategy to action.	Lack of experience in higher education administration. No demonstrated ability to articulate the mission of a public research university, to any of the necessary stakeholders. No experience with the kind of fundraising and donor cultivation that we'll need from the next president.	While I appreciate the need for change to meet challenges in higher ed, we need an experienced and passionate advocate who knows the details of our industry.
Staff		This is NOT a candidate most faculty, staff, students or alumni want. He is a lightning rod for controversy. He has NO experience managing the complexities of a public higher education institution, especially one with a complex medical campus. His close ties to Mitch Daniels and Marlyn Jischke at Purdue are cause for concern; faculty and staff at Purdue are not happy with their current leadership; Bruce Rastetter may be enamored by Daniels' brand of "leadership," but it won't fly with most of U of Iowa.	The BOR only added salt to the wound today by announcing they're recommending UI receive 0% funding increase next year, with our two sister schools receiving 8% on average. Bernstein is a much better option; one who will bring people together in creative ways to be entrepreneurial, yet based on an understanding of academia, to move UI forward...pulling together, not against each other or the BOR as I believe Harreld would do.
Staff		Lack of knowledge of UI, lack of enough knowledge about higher education for the job of president. Handled himself poorly at forum. Often gave poor answers, did not answer the question, reacted negatively to audience.	I understand the interest in bringing in a candidate with an unusual background, but this particular individual is not qualified to be the president of the University of Iowa.
Staff		As a staff member, I was dismayed that not only did he have no ideas for helping staff, but he seemed uninterested in developing any.	

Staff	None.	Complete lack of knowledge about what a research university is. Disrespectful. Uninterested.	This candidate has to be a joke.
Staff	Ability to disengage from a situation and look at it objectively and pragmatically.	<p>Business consultant mentality; academic institutions can learn from business management principles but they are NOT businesses. If Bruce had been able to demonstrate his ability to transform an academic institution through his consultancy, and had held any sort of academic leadership position, he may have had sufficient relevant experience to be credible. But he has not and is not credible.</p> <p>Commitment: He appears to have emerged from semi-retirement to take on a new challenge. But consultants have a reputation of coming into an organization, disrupting it (not always for good), and then leaving. Since he has nothing to lose, he may do exactly that. Some of his responses were a little too argumentative and dismissive (Donald Trumpist) and inappropriate under the circumstances. While there was a need to cut people off so others could ask questions but he could have handled it better.</p>	<p>If the suspicion and hostility demonstrated by the audience is any indication of what the whole UI community would feel, he would have no ability to lead effectively. RE "Ivy" comment: Why do so many graduates and faculty of east-coast schools think that we want to emulate them?</p>
Staff		<p>Lack of understanding of higher education and what the university of Iowa values.</p>	<p>A concern of mine and others is his ability to speak in an inclusive way to all stakeholders in the UI community. The way he spoke about students, faculty, and staff, was not positive or supportive. If he is hired, there is concern that he will not do what is best for UI but what is best for the regents (i.e. Support, performance based funding). His lack of knowledge around Title IX and that is a MAJOR concern.</p>

Staff

There really are none, in terms of this position. He is utterly unqualified for this position, and it's embarrassing that he is a finalist.

His performance at the public forum was really awful. He was the only one of the four candidates who didn't have prepared remarks, and he was the one who should have. He doesn't know what he doesn't know and clearly didn't even take the time to do some basic homework. Without prepared remarks he just rambled from one topic to another, with no insight, focus, or plan. He used one cliché after another and betrayed not having thought through any topic. He said we needed to get away from the policies and procedures of the past without saying what or why. He said that Iowa competes with community colleges and technical schools schools which we don't. He said we exist to make the citizens of Iowa better educated citizens when that is clearly not our core mission as a research institution. The question and answer session was even worse. I would say that he never answered a single question, again, because he doesn't know the issues or what we do. He got a Title 9 question and clearly didn't know what that was. He flubbed the question on tenure. He didn't even try to answer most questions but instead retreated to gobbledygook and consultant speak. It was embarrassing for him and the institution to have a candidate like that after the very polished and superb performance of Joseph Steinmetz the night before. If we hire him we'll be the laughingstock of AAU institutions. I don't know how we could ever attract a serious candidate for a future search. He has no scholarly publications; the meager writing he has done betrays no original ideas or rigorous thought. He has no academic administrative experience and he would not be competitive for a tenure track assistant professorship in business. How could he possibly lead faculty researchers doing cutting edge research when he has never done that himself.

How can the feedback process extend until midnight Wednesday with a decision Thursday? No one that I have talked to believes that any of these comments will be read or valued because there is no time to do so. This search process is very non-standard and will be damaging for years to come.

Staff

None.

This candidate is entirely inappropriate for this position and would be a terrible leader for the University of Iowa. This candidate has no experience with leadership of a research-intensive institution. This candidate also made a serious omission on his own application materials, using the name of an LLC company that actually does not exist. Furthermore, this candidate had only vague suggestions about how to lead this university in the 21st century. Several of the other candidates had strong visions on how to make the University of Iowa great, but this candidate seems only want to reduce the teaching staff and devalue teaching at this institution.

The Board of Regents should show effective leadership and not select this candidate to be the next president of the University of Iowa.

Staff			Is this a joke? Seriously. If this guy is hired it will confirm the fears many are having about the state of current educational climate.
Staff			I smell a "rat" on this one. Seems like a great guy, but the Regents have enough power as things stand now. We need an academic as our UI President.
Staff	Good speaker - without notes.	Lack of academic experience. I felt his responses to some were dismissive. He seems very top down despite what he said in his remarks.	I think you would do a disservice to this community if you recommend this candidate. Monday's candidate was strongest by far.
Staff	Steinmetz has the experience and knowledge to lead a major research institution like UI.	Harreld would be a sad statement on the condition of the state of Iowa and the Board of Regents and could lead to some very disastrous outcomes for UI	There has been a lack of transparency and diversity in this search process and it is feared by many that the 'successful' candidate was already chosen prior to these forums especially since the search committee was dismissed prior to the completion of the process and not allowed to make a ranking order of the finalists.
Staff	This is the ONLY qualified candidate		Although Mr. Harreld would be the Regents' choice for obvious reasons (business/agribusiness background), conservative leanings, religious preference, etc., I think the fact that he couldn't be bothered to proofread his CV and the discrepancies between the employment history he presents and what would seem to be a more accurate account of his career, should disqualify him from running. I think we should have an educator for President--not someone who has taught a few classes in the business school as an adjunct.
Student	None. Not a single thing.	Lack of experience, and worse lack of understanding of what it takes to run an academic institution. And even worse than that doesn't have the patience or the humility to listen and learn. He said he can forsee sending UI dollars to other Iowa institutions, does not know what Title XI is, couldn't come up with administrative strategies that would increase diversity or inclusion, or enhance the work environment of under-represented groups. He has no clue!	It was offensive and disrespectful how he treated undergraduates or people of color. He kept rolling his eyes or responding with condescension, and interrupting them. This man is in now way shape or form fit to lead an institution. He does not have, nor will he likely have the respect of any of the constituents of this university community.
Student	None		He made it look like he was an executive of an important company, and he revealed on the forum that company was one person, himself. This person is an IMPOSTOR! Open your eyes Board of Regents.

Student	Brings a new perspective, strong/quick learner, and is unique in his disassociation from Academia- which I see as a great thing	Dismissive of role of students and young teachers/professors, responded to criticism defensively at times, speech was a bit muddled, lack of concrete examples	I think it would be amazing to have someone business minded as a University President, but he has A LOT to learn.
Student	Mr. Harreld was able to maintain a level of tolerance and patience during the question portion of the forum, when many people expressed strong displeasure at his candidacy for president of the university.	Unfortunately, Mr. Harreld does not have the background in academia and/or academic institutions that warrants his being elected as the next president. He was unable to answer simple questions about how he would handle problems within the university world, and that did not inspire confidence.	As a graduate student, I am very worried that Mr. Harreld will not maintain an environment conducive to graduate student development here at the University of Iowa. He mentioned, negatively, that undergraduates get "70% of 'touches' [he acknowledged not know what this meant, exactly] from TAs," and then he commented that we do not know how to teach and should not have such a close relation to undergraduate students. When asked about continuing support for graduate students, Mr. Harreld did not provide a strong or reliable answer to the public. I think it would be best to pick another candidate to act as the new president of the University of Iowa. Others have much more experience in academia and in how these institutions are run, and I feel that my experience as a graduate student here will benefit much more from another candidate being elected.
Student	His vision and initial remarks were impressive and inspiring, and it was great to hear perspectives from someone outside of education. He also seemed to handle many prodding questions and aggressive questions in decent ways until the askers got aggressive.	It was frustrating to watch people who asked questions be belittled. He didn't mention students much, which was very concerning.	
Student			Bruce disclosed during breakfast with students that he met with the Governor of Iowa prior to his campus visit. Were other candidates permitted to do so? I find this highly problematic and inappropriate.

Student		<p>I met with each candidate during a student breakfast. The group discussion focused on navigating difficult issues, such as sexual assault and racism on a college campus. While it was a lively discussion, I left feeling concerned about his understanding of the higher education landscape and student experience. At first glance, I can somewhat understand the appeal of Bruce as a so-called "risk" in an effort to do things differently. But after spending time with him, it's clear that this is a risk with many unintended consequences. I don't believe a university education is a commodity or a product. I want a president with expertise in educational governance, teaching and learning, and research that can influence our core mission and not how we "do business."</p>	<p>I attended the University of Iowa 10 years ago for my undergraduate degree and returned for my doctorate. I have an immense sense of pride for this university. I say this because I would be happy with any of the first three candidates as a future president of the University of Iowa. However, I would lose trust in my university if we move forward with the hire of Bruce Harreld.</p>
Student		<p>No background as an administrator for higher education.</p>	<p>Very nervous about the lack of an educational background. I fear the regents would love to have someone run UI as a business and less as an educational institution as they are more worried about money and less worried about providing a world class education. It seems to be a lack of consistency regarding his current business dealings. As a future alumnus I am very worried about this candidate</p>
Unknown		<p>No academic experience! Non-stellar business leadership background. This candidate's careless creation of personal CV is troublesome. The business model this candidate endorses is too narrowly focused on "return on investment." ROI in academia is hard to measure. E.g. "starting salary" is not a very good metric.</p>	<p>We need a leader who understands all of academia, the sciences, arts, and humanities. This leader needs to be a credible communicator within the academic realm.</p>
Unknown	Outside perspective	<p>Lack of understanding of educational sector. Lack of ability to deal effectively with those who disagree with him. Evidence base cited was Wikipedia. Will be extremely divisive and therefore ineffective.</p>	

Unknown

Harreld seemed to take a no-tolerance approach to sexual assault on campus. I appreciated this.

I thought I have confidence in the ability of Krislov, Bernstein or Steinmetz to lead this university, I have to say that Harreld demonstrated his lack of understanding of how a research university works. For example, he talked about further research in medical sciences and teaching in liberal arts. In response to a question about inclusive practices, he indicated that he had no connection with staff at IBM. His performance during the public forum was disrespectful and arrogant in tone and revealed some very worrisome insights into his past, his approach and his abilities. He several times rolled his eyes at questioners and then made a statement something like "if you don't like me, get rid of me." Flip comments such as this communicated to me that he does not respect the amount of time and effort that goes into a presidential search and does not appreciate that he might move on in two years, but those of us committed to UI will live with the consequences of his presidency if he were to come here. His way of responding to difficult questions or interacting with people who may challenge him does not suggest that he has the ability to be the public face of a public university. Most alarming of all, his presence at leader of UI would put the university at risk of scandal. He has lied on his resume, suggesting either dishonesty or a disturbing level of carelessness. He has been named in lawsuits that he has settled. This makes me worry that he would bring some scandal upon the university.

Unknown

MBA, will potentially run University according to a consumer/corporate business model which will only exacerbate challenges faced by students and faculty today, including but not limited to, increasing student loan debt (due to being profit-driven), grade inflation (due to viewing students as customers rather than people who are there to learn something new), etc.

Unknown It's difficult for me to see any, I'm afraid to say.

Does not seem to understand what a research university is all about; does not have a terminal degree nor administrative experience in an academic setting (the two specified preferred qualifications in the job description); his talk was a series of platitudes, in keeping with his history as a consultant; would have no legitimacy in decisions about tenure since his MBA would not qualify him for tenure at our institution nor any other research institution--among the 220 faculty listed at the Tippie College of Business, for example, no one with an MBA as the highest degree has a position beyond adjunct lecturer or visiting lecturer; all tenured or tenure track faculty with MBAs also have PhDs; seems to bring out the worst in people, if his presentation and question/answer session on campus is any indication--not a quality we need nor a quality that marks a visionary leader, which we do need. He would struggle for legitimacy among many members of the university community, including alumni, because of his lack of experience in academic communities and his apparent lack of intellectual curiosity. Why would he believe that looking up information on Wikipedia would be sufficient? Amazing.

Mr. Harreld's position as a finalist for the UI presidency is an embarrassment. Were he to be chosen by the Regents, we would become the laughingstock of universities across the country. A person involved in insider trading? A person who, at best, failed to review his cv for accuracy before submitting it or, at worst, falsified information? A person who would come in under a wave of distrust? Our reputation would suffer were he to be our next president. Let me repeat. Our reputation would suffer. Only if the search was rigged, would Harreld be selected by the Board of Regents. And if he is selected, many in the community will see it as yet another act of vindictiveness against the University by the Regents, a "backdoor" way of diminishing UI's standing and increasing JSU's and UNI's in the process. Can the Board of Regents really be so blind? Can they really be that craven?

Unknown

His responses demonstrated a poor understanding of an R1 institution. I thought his comment about turning Iowa into a Midwest Ivy showed a complete disregard for Iowa being a PUBLIC institution that educates citizens of the state (though, unlike other state institutions in Iowa, we abide by the Regents Admissions Index and do not go lower...because those students would likely not be successful in strong academic curricula). On a side note, I disliked when he said that excellence ruins companies/institutions. Did he learn that from Harvard?

I do not understand why someone with a 3 page CV, which included "Significant Sig of Sigma Chi Fraternity" was invited in the first place. He lacks many relevant credentials, and will never have the buy-in of faculty, staff, or graduate students.

Unknown

It is very upsetting that a candidate without solid academic credentials would be a finalist for the position of president at the University of Iowa.

Unknown

Lack of knowledge of universities, complex public systems that cannot be equated entirely with for-profit corporations. Insulting lack of knowledge of Iowa specifically -- no awareness of Title IX, mangled his response to sexual assault query, didn't even know the interim president was an interim. His presentation style was also troubling -- someone who gets defensive and lacks polish will not represent the university well in public.

Unknown

I am not familiar with any strengths of this candidate.

This candidate has caused concern to faculty and administration as to being out of touch with the university and the needs of academic institutions. This candidate appears to be under consideration based on the assumption that success in business is the definition of good leadership and that all institutions should behave according to business principles; these are assumptions I strongly disagree with, as bottom-line business "strategies" are often disastrous to businesses, undermine community and are not applicable to non-profit or service institutions.

I would have liked to review the forum videos in order to form my own opinion of this candidate, but they have not been provided in time for me to complete this survey. All I have to go on is the candidate's CV, news articles and the rumors I have heard from others who attended the meeting and are VERY concerned about the appropriateness of this candidate. I am beginning to wonder if the video has not been available because the search committee wants to hide this candidate from the public view.

Unknown

Precious few, as far as I can tell. I approached the candidacy of someone lacking university background with an open mind, but nothing in his background or public forum gave me reason to believe he's ready for the transition.

Lacks fundamental understanding of the university mission, though he can echo standard media discussions about many of the concerns about academia today (eg cost/value ratio). Lacks fundamental interest in intellectual inquiry. Part of the job - perhaps THE CENTRAL job - of the president is to advocate for the university, yet he states he wouldn't necessarily object to shifting funding from UI to other regents universities. (President should collaborate with other regents universities, but that must coexist with always advocating for UI.) Someone with an executive business background should have experience in diversity programming, yet he says he has none. And his error in his listing of his business (which state) is at best a shocking act of carelessness, which would be dangerous for UI. And the president must always, always relate well to his variety of constituents, yet the candidate snapped at questioners at the forum.

It would be a terrible mistake to hire him - bad for the people of Iowa, who entrust their children to us for their education, bad for the people of Iowa who count on us to tend to their health, on and on and on,

Unknown		Mr. Harreld is not qualified for university administration. He has not held any university or educational administration positions whatsoever, nor has he even held any primary faculty appointments. His experience is in organizations whose goal is financial profit, which is not the mission of a public financial institution. Even those institutions had questionable gains during his time--Kraft was increasing in profits prior to his arrival, and IBM arguably was static in growth during his time there, only increasing after he left.	
Unknown	Mr. Harreld's "TED Talk" approach to his presentation and vision of the University, however unsuitable for the presidency, might have a place in a visiting consultant role.	Mr. Harreld lacks the understanding of academic life needed to lead the University. I believe his presidency would result in an overall loss of morale in the faculty and threaten the well-being of the University at a time when strong, thoughtful and integrated leadership is needed.	Unfortunately I find the final candidate, Bruce Harreld, lacking in experience, and lacking the requisite deep understanding of academe needed to lead the University.
Unknown	He is exceptionally skilled at evading questions and obfuscating his answers using business jargon mostly unfamiliar to members of an academic community. He is well suited for streamlining the budget and furthering the assault on tenure.	Obviously his greatest weakness is love of money. He implied that because he moves among the super rich, he can 'help' (save) the university by giving even greater control over research and programming to his corporate allies.	This process is a sham. Given the disparity between the resume of Harreld and the other candidates, it is abundantly clear that the decision was made before these snap townhall meetings were called, so the university community is just being placated. So the only thing to comment here is: we are not fooled.
Unknown		Didn't know what Title IX was. Had nothing to say about helping to create an inclusive atmosphere for staff.	
Unknown		Why is the Harreld public forum unavailable online?	
Unknown	No apparent strengths to be President of a Research 1 university.	This candidate has no demonstrated ability to lead a complex academic research institution and medical center.	This candidate is completely unqualified to lead a Research 1 University.
Unknown		This candidate has no experience whatsoever in the world of universities and, quite simply, is unqualified to be the president of the University of Iowa. His inclusion as a finalist is an embarrassment to the university, as it suggests that the university couldn't even scrounge up four qualified candidates for the position of president. That the search committee even thought that he could be president reflects poorly on the committee and, especially, on the regents.	
Unknown		Harreld is dangerously unfamiliar with the basic workings of university administration. He seemed not to understand what Title IX is, which is shocking and alarming. His presentation was by far the weakest.	

Unknown		He has no experience in the administration of a university of any type, and therefore has no understanding of the University enterprise. He has a simplistic view of the issues facing major universities at this time, and this limited view is based upon books that he has read in the popular press. This would be an incredibly embarrassing choice for the state, the university, and for the Parker Executive Search firm.
Unknown	None seen	No compassion or understanding. Gave a rote speech. The worst of the 4, seems like someone who will say and do whatever the politicians want. Will not be a good representative for U of I
Unknown		Oh my god, this guy is in so far over his head. He has literally no idea how universities work. If I get any reassurance out of this, it's that if the Regents install their buddy here, he'll be reduced to a jelly inside five months. Then we'll spend another year with the Regents pretending he's functioning and trying to backslap him into taking control when he can't even find the door. And then we'll have another very expensive search process, likely with some side punishment for UI. The stupid thing is that it'll be two or three years wasted where we effectively have no leadership, and that matters. Well, I'm glad my kid will have options, anyway.
Unknown	Refreshing outlook on process and willingness to listen. Handles himself well in an unfriendly environment. Polished, articulate and would represent the University well to external groups	Lack of extensive higher education experience, which may not be a weakness
Unknown		All good candidates - 1st three are more of what we have - Bruce's experience in changing organizations is a big + to helping a very conservative traditional University move forward. As an institution that prides itself on diversity it amazes me how narrow and protective we can be in NOT accepting someone different than our traditional selves. Given the questioning, I am embarrassed for us as a University to attempt to intimidate someone and treat him so shabbily
Unknown		Lack of relevant experience and knowledge about the institution and academia in general; lack of interest in learning about it
Unknown	Apparent plausibility; much better at answering questions honestly than in giving a prepared speech. His prepared speech was terrible, but his answers were more close to the competence we expect.	Glibbing, inarticulate, incoherent, uninformed. Someone who believes that talk is the point, and not the content of the talk. Unbelievable that anyone would want him to represent an academic institution.
		This candidate is absolutely unacceptable
		If snake oil needs a shape then it could be poured into his clothing. He used every phrase from the buzzword playbook but said very little. I would not follow him and I would not be proud of my institution any more.

Unknown	He's supposedly a successful corporate businessman.	His forum made it clear that he does not have adequate experience in higher education, nor was he able to answer the excellent questions of the audience. His frequent eye rolling during interchanges alone make him a very bad choice and he should not be considered.	On no account should he be chosen as UI president.
Unknown		I'm sorry. This dude appears to have no idea what he's talking about, and is talking to fill air, hoping that some of his experience intersects with the enterprise that is a university. Even he's not really sure why he's here. I'm actually starting to feel bad for the guy. I'll watch the questions later but expect it'll be a cringe-fest. To the Regents: it's an actual job. Please pick someone who's qualified to do the job.	
Unknown		Does not have a PhD.	
Unknown	No academic background or scholarship and no evidence even knows what it involves.		Making a successful business leader with no academic background a University President seems an unlikely fit. Even business leaders tend to circulate in a certain type of business as here primarily in the food industry with an information technology in business bent. It might be nice to have a modicum of some evidence of academic exposure beyond the food service. Why don't chairs of english departments apply as CEOs of the food industry? It's the same thing in reverse. Doubt they'd get an interview but Universities pride themselves on open-mindedness. Just think about it first please
Unknown			I like that the university is considering someone who has experience outside the academic world. too often academics live in a world that is so distant from the real world their graduates are moving into.. more of the changes that are happening into the business world need to be imported in the the college scene. universities need to change and perhaps someone with business experience could be a change agent for the university scene.

Unknown

There was an appalling lack of decency and civility demonstrated by some UI faculty, students and staff at the open meeting today. The people who asked questions, actually, the line up of people who lectured Bruce, do not in my opinion represent anywhere near the best this place has to offer. Out came all kinds of individuals, with an assortment of agendas. Bruce did a fine job in a tough environment. He was thoughtful, without being condescending, and his talk indicated considerable research and inquiry. If he is appointed president, some in this place will disrupt, but I think he offers a real opportunity for positive change.

If president, he will be the most successful external representative the UI has ever had as president. His internal status with some of the culture-bound faculty is another matter.