

To whom it may concern:

I am writing upon the suggestion of my colleague, Sarah Gardial, who is a member of the Search Committee.

I appreciate the ability to participate in what I feel has been a successful search process. In addition, I would specifically note that I have been comfortable with the process and the time tables at which the process has occurred.

I have had the opportunity to meet with all four candidates and to listen to their answers to a consistent set of questions asked by the Council of Deans in order to evaluate and compare their positions.

Based on our opportunity to meet as a group with each candidate, my participation in the open forums, and a review of their background information, I believe that Krislov, Bernstein and Steinmetz are best qualified for the position of President at the UI.

I respect the Board's decision and appreciate your consideration of my input. Thank you.

Sincerely,

John C. Keller  
Associate Provost and Dean, the Graduate College  
The University of Iowa

Name: Keri Hornbuckle

Company Name: University of Iowa

Email Address: [keri-hornbuckle@uiowa.edu](mailto:keri-hornbuckle@uiowa.edu) Phone Number: 3193355148 Your Message:

Regarding the search for a new president at the University of Iowa, I am writing to express my support for Dr. Joe Steinmetz as the strongest candidate for the position. Dr. Steinmetz was an external reviewer for the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences ten year review. He showed himself to be highly knowledgeable of university structure and was able to make substantial suggestions for positive change. He interacted well with universities leaders, faculty, students, and staff even while providing challenging observations and criticism.

The only other acceptable candidate is Dr. Michael Bernstein. His experience and leadership are of the level and breadth appropriate for the Presidency of the University of Iowa. I rank him second to Steinmetz but much higher than Mr. Krislov.

Mr. Harreld is not qualified.

## **J. Bruce Harreld feedback**

The University of Iowa Faculty Council offers the following comments on presidential candidate J. Bruce Harreld. Faculty Council is the 20-member executive council of the Faculty Senate and is made up of elected faculty representatives from all colleges at the university. Faculty Council offers two sources of faculty feedback on Mr. Harreld. First, we offer Faculty Council's collective summary and evaluation of Mr. Harreld based on a meeting with Council on the morning of his visit and on the public forum.

Second, we offer a summary of a great deal of feedback that Faculty Council has received from faculty around campus.

## **Faculty Council assessment**

During Faculty Council's meeting with Mr. Harreld, Council members asked a number of questions and there was also two-way dialogue.

Some Council members noted strengths including his vision for big change and his focus on the core missions of education and research. Some felt he was personable and could potentially interact in an open and productive way with the Board of Regents. He voiced support for the role of tenured faculty.

However, there were serious concerns about his ability to lead the University of Iowa, most prominently his admitted lack of university leadership experience. His answers to several questions revealed a lack of depth in understanding how a large university functions, the realities of research funding and of classroom education, and the nature of tenure and faculty governance. He also expressed a lack of understanding in the expectations and challenges of our students, and of sensitive issues of diversity and safety on campus. He brings values of business which differ in important ways from the value systems of higher education. He did not listen well and frequently dominated the conversation.

## **Faculty opinions**

Although many faculty expressed regrets about the disrespectful tone of some comments in the open forum, faculty overwhelmingly expressed deep concerns about Mr. Harreld's candidacy, particularly about his lack of experience in a university leadership position. They appreciated that he directly acknowledged this issue. Nevertheless, the faculty believe such experience is essential to implement effectively any vision for transformation. This would also affect his ability to interact with and respond to the university's varied constituents. Indeed, some felt he would face great hostility and mistrust from faculty. There were also concerns about mistakes that were made in his resume and his lack of understanding of how a public university differs from a private company as well as many basic issues affecting higher education, such as Title IX.

Overall, while the faculty and Council embrace a need for positive change, there was an overwhelming consensus that Mr. Harreld would not be effective at moving the University of Iowa forward.

## **Marvin Krislov Feedback**

Faculty Council is a 20-member executive council of the elected Faculty Senate. This assessment is the consensus opinion of the Faculty Council based on two sources of information: our 1 hour meeting with President Krislov and observation of the open forum and feedback received by the council from faculty around the campus.

The faculty council felt that President Marvin Krislov expressed a positive and motivating vision for the University of Iowa. His strong belief in the value of a large public educational institution and the values it embodies, including access, affordability, and excellence resonated well. Dr. Krislov identified realistic strategies to move toward a top 10 status through support for fund raising in specific programs, such as medicine and engineering, multi-disciplinary challenges or "big themes" and technology transfer. He also provided convincing evidence of his strong commitment to faculty and staff shared governance, the ability to develop strong and collaborative teams and multiple levels of the institution, and a management style of constructive negotiation, delegation and empowerment. The faculty council felt that President Krislov would be particularly capable of building transparent and principled relationships with Board of Regents members, legislators, and other university presidents in Iowa. He has also demonstrated an ability to raise funds that would be very useful at UI. President Krislov dealt sensitively with student, especially minority student concerns, during the open forum, suggesting he would be received well by a broad range of students.

Some concern among the Faculty Council were expressed regarding President Krislov's lack of experience with an institution of the size and complexity of the University of Iowa, although his experience in government and at the University of Michigan mitigated these concerns among the board members considerably. Although President Krislov expressed a sincere belief that he could make the University of Iowa better, many of his answers during the open forum focused on his values but lacked specificity. The faculty council had some concerns that President Krislov might not be the decisive decision maker and agent of institutional change required at this time.

### **Faculty council received comments from faculty primarily via email.**

Representative comments expressed the view that President Krislov would bring "a breath of fresh air so needed in this atmosphere of dissolution and low morale." Several expressed positive reactions to his personality, including his warmth, humor, humility, willingness to listen and integrity. His JD, his breadth of experience in federal government as well as multiple roles in academic settings in Big 10 as well as a small private liberal arts college are strengths frequently commented upon. Other major strengths observed are his commitment to diversity and inclusion, his work with the local community, his depth of understanding of the issues facing higher education, his strong background in leadership positions, and ability to be a sophisticated, intelligent, energetic, and engaged President of the university.

Many commenters found no weaknesses in President Krislov. Of those that did, some expressed the view that, although he "pleaded ignorance of local conditions," such a response was appropriate since offering solutions for specific issues was not really possible. However, others felt that "he was more adept than I hoped at evading answering questions" and didn't express a clear vision specific to the University of Iowa. Several perceived that a weakness was that he did not have strong scholarly output or first-hand experience with the research enterprise of a medical school. Thus, he hadn't "offered much depth of insight into the issues facing

researchers who must seek highly competitive federal and private funding to maintain their programs of research." One representative comment felt that his "positions are fairly standard – nothing was surprising . . . his balanced approach makes great sense – except when it doesn't, and those are the crucial moments." The same individual says that s/he "wanted to hear VISION from him that was path-breaking, not retreads."

Overall, the response to President Krislov was overwhelmingly positive, with some minor reservations around the details of his vision and his ability to implement change sufficient to reinvigorate the University of Iowa.

### **Joseph Steinmetz feedback**

The University of Iowa Faculty Council offers the following comments on presidential candidate Joseph Steinmetz. Faculty Council is the 20-member executive council of the Faculty Senate and is made up of elected faculty representatives from all colleges at the university. Faculty Council offers two sources of faculty feedback on Dr. Steinmetz. First, we offer Faculty Council's collective summary and evaluation of Dr. Steinmetz based on a meeting with Council on the morning of his visit and on the public forum.

Second, we offer a summary of feedback that Faculty Council has received from faculty around campus.

### **Faculty Council assessment**

Faculty Council was overwhelmingly impressed by Dr. Steinmetz's experience, knowledge, and demonstrated aptitude for the position of President of the University of Iowa. He has progressively served in a number of administrative positions, from department chair to dean to provost in CIC institutions. He demonstrated an impressive understanding of the fiscal and operational challenges universities are facing in general, as well as familiarity with UI. He provided concrete examples from his current and former universities of things he has done or is working on to address these challenges. He was persuasive on the importance of the UI to the state, a great story that needs to be told over and over. His role as president, in part, would be to facilitate and celebrate learning and discovery. He believes all faculty, staff and students should be able to name what we do, how we do it and what the president did to achieve our goals.

Faculty council appreciated Dr. Steinmetz's philosophy in dealing with his board of trustees and the legislature, which is to educate rather than confront, and to build relationships. In doing so, he uses data to support his recommendations. In dealing with faculty, staff and students, his approach is to be transparent and collaborative. For example, he meets with a university senate comprised of faculty, administration, and students about six times per year and every policy sent to the board of trustees goes through this senate first. His track record of success includes his work combining seven humanities-oriented colleges into a single college (and reducing the number of administrators in the process). He was able to move this through shared governance with no negative votes.

Dr. Steinmetz convinced the Faculty Council of his ability to lead the UI through many specific details of his administration at Ohio State University.

He has recognized opportunities and constraints and acted for the advancement of the institution. His creation of the Discovery Themes, including one specifically dedicated to the liberal arts and humanities, indicates his interest in scholarly innovation and interdisciplinary scholarship. In addition, he presented technical information with consideration of the perspective and relevance the information has for the audience/stakeholder. He is personable in a manner that will resonate with Iowans.

In his meeting with the faculty councilors, Dr. Steinmetz's primary question was whether faculty were ready to engage in the kind of changes that would transform the University. This resonated greatly with council members.

He was engaging, open about his priorities, and showed a sense of humor. In sum, council believes that Dr. Steinmetz would collaborate with the Regents and legislature, would work well

with faculty, staff and students, would be a good ambassador for UI in the state, and would be a creative leader unafraid to take reasonable investment risks to move UI forward.

### **Faculty opinion**

A number of faculty commented on Dr. Steinmetz to faculty councilors through emails and personal communication. The consistent themes were that Dr. Steinmetz has outstanding experience in and knowledge of higher education, has demonstrated a commitment to academic freedom, administrative transparency, and is committed to diversity and inclusion (though some individuals thought his responses during the town hall were not strong enough). He came across as approachable and willing to listen. His presentation style seemed to some as less polished than a couple of the other candidates, but even those who mentioned this were impressed by the substance of his remarks and answers to questions. While a few added concern that his vision statement was somewhat vague, the overwhelming majority indicated that he would be an outstanding and visionary President of the University of Iowa.

## **Michael Bernstein feedback**

The University of Iowa Faculty Council offers the following comments on presidential candidate Michael Bernstein. Faculty Council is the 20-member executive council of the Faculty Senate and is made up of elected faculty representatives from all colleges at the university. Faculty Council offers two sources of faculty feedback on Provost Bernstein. First, we offer Faculty Council's collective evaluation of Provost Bernstein's meeting with Council on the morning of his visit. Second, we offer a summary of a great deal of feedback that Faculty Council has received from faculty around campus.

### **Faculty Council's meeting with Provost Bernstein**

Faculty Council was, on the whole, quite positive about Bernstein. Council members liked that he has a strong vision for transformation. They also admired his strong publication/scholarship record and believed that he understands what it means to be a faculty member engaged in research. They liked that he is consultative and at the same time would not be afraid to make decisions. They appreciated his knowledge of higher education and perceived that he has a number of ideas for moving forward. While some felt that he did not explain how he would implement or pay for his initiatives, most believed he is a smart and strategic thinker.

Some Faculty Council members felt that his tone was a little harsh at times and questioned whether he has a good temperament for dealing with difficult circumstances. Similarly, several wondered whether his personality would facilitate good relationships with Iowans, alumni, donors, legislators, and others. Most felt that those constituencies would likely warm up to him over time, but that the first impression might be less favorable than with other candidates.

### **General Feedback from Faculty**

Bernstein is a strong candidate with excellent academic credentials and extensive university administration experience (including in healthcare areas). Several faculty commented favorably on his academic background in the humanities as this is a traditional strength at UI, while others noted that his economic background is a strength in approaching the economic realities and new funding models for 21st century universities. He seems to have genuine commitments and ideas related to college affordability, diversity, faculty development, and academic freedom. Bernstein is articulate and poised. Moreover, he appears decisive and assertive and does not shy away from discussing sensitive topics. Faculty described him as practical, direct, agenda-driven, and adept at answering tough questions. Some viewed his strong personality as a potential asset in advocating to the BOR and legislature for resources to implement his new programs and initiatives. Others found him to show interpersonal skills that suggest he would be a successful fundraiser and make positive connections with alumni and donors. He is willing to make difficult academic decisions for programmatic and financial reasons, as shown in the post-Katrina Tulane environment. He has experience with challenges similar to those on our campus involving alcohol abuse, sexual assault, and crisis management. He was adept at identifying underlying issues posed in public forum questions and then responding to the complexities of those issues.

Some faculty were concerned that he appeared to advocate conflict as a leadership style and that his clearly forceful and direct personality may alienate certain sectors of UI constituents, including BOR members or the legislature. During the public forum, his description of "at risk"

students in sexual assault circumstances was noted as a poor response because it might have suggested to some that he thought women were to blame for bringing on their assault. His vision statements were viewed by some faculty as fairly standard (and possibly overwhelming in scope) and not particularly unique from what one would expect from an informed person speaking about today's public universities. Despite Bernstein's academic background in the humanities, several faculty noted concerns with his role in closing a graduate program in English at Tulane. Some faculty also lamented his emphasis on linking arts and humanities with the STEM disciplines, rather than on the inherent value of arts and humanities.

In conclusion, the faculty as a whole are supportive of Bernstein and many are very enthusiastic about his candidacy.

Name: Faculty Council Presidential Search Feedback Company Name: University of Iowa Email  
Address: [edward-gillan@uiowa.edu](mailto:edward-gillan@uiowa.edu) Phone Number: 319-335-1308 Your Message:  
Michael Bernstein feedback

The University of Iowa Faculty Council offers the following comments on presidential candidate Michael Bernstein. Faculty Council is the 20-member executive council of the Faculty Senate and is made up of elected faculty representatives from all colleges at the university. Faculty Council offers two sources of faculty feedback on Provost Bernstein. First, we offer Faculty Council's collective evaluation of Provost Bernstein's meeting with Council on the morning of his visit. Second, we offer a summary of a great deal of feedback that Faculty Council has received from faculty around campus.

#### Faculty Council's meeting with Provost Bernstein

Faculty Council was, on the whole, quite positive about Bernstein. Council members liked that he has a strong vision for transformation. They also admired his strong publication/scholarship record and believed that he understands what it means to be a faculty member engaged in research. They liked that he is consultative and at the same time would not be afraid to make decisions. They appreciated his knowledge of higher education and perceived that he has a number of ideas for moving forward. While some felt that he did not explain how he would implement or pay for his initiatives, most believed he is a smart and strategic thinker.

Some Faculty Council members felt that his tone was a little harsh at times and questioned whether he has a good temperament for dealing with difficult circumstances. Similarly, several wondered whether his personality would facilitate good relationships with Iowans, alumni, donors, legislators, and others. Most felt that those constituencies would likely warm up to him over time, but that the first impression might be less favorable than with other candidates.

#### General Feedback from Faculty

Bernstein is a strong candidate with excellent academic credentials and extensive university administration experience (including in healthcare areas). Several faculty commented favorably on his academic background in the humanities as this is a traditional strength at UI, while others noted that his economic background is a strength in approaching the economic realities and new funding models for 21st century universities. He seems to have genuine commitments and ideas related to college affordability, diversity, faculty development, and academic freedom.

Bernstein is articulate and poised. Moreover, he appears decisive and assertive and does not shy away from discussing sensitive topics. Faculty described him as practical, direct, agenda-driven, and adept at answering tough questions. Some viewed his strong personality as a potential asset in advocating to the BOR and legislature for resources to implement his new programs and initiatives. Others found him to show interpersonal skills that suggest he would be a successful fundraiser and make positive connections with alumni and donors. He is willing to make difficult academic decisions for programmatic and financial reasons, as shown in the post-Katrina Tulane environment. He has experience with challenges similar to those on our campus involving alcohol abuse, sexual assault, and crisis management. He was adept at identifying underlying issues posed in public forum questions and then responding to the complexities of those issues.

Some faculty were concerned that he appeared to advocate conflict as a leadership style and that his clearly forceful and direct personality may alienate certain sectors of UI constituents, including BOR members or the legislature. During the public forum, his description of "at risk" students in sexual assault circumstances was noted as a poor response because it might have suggested to some that he thought women were to blame for bringing on their assault.

His vision statements were viewed by some faculty as fairly standard (and possibly overwhelming in scope) and not particularly unique from what one would expect from an informed person speaking about today's public universities. Despite Bernstein's academic background in the humanities, several faculty noted concerns with his role in closing a graduate program in English at Tulane. Some faculty also lamented his emphasis on linking arts and humanities with the STEM disciplines, rather than on the inherent value of arts and humanities.

In conclusion, the faculty as a whole are supportive of Bernstein and many are very enthusiastic about his candidacy.

---

Name: Faculty Council Presidential candidate feedback Company Name: University of Iowa Email Address: [peter-snyder@uiowa.edu](mailto:peter-snyder@uiowa.edu) Phone Number:  
Your Message:

J. Bruce Harreld feedback

The University of Iowa Faculty Council offers the following comments on presidential candidate J. Bruce Harreld. Faculty Council is the 20-member executive council of the Faculty Senate and is made up of elected faculty representatives from all colleges at the university. Faculty Council offers two sources of faculty feedback on Mr. Harreld. First, we offer Faculty Council's collective summary and evaluation of Mr. Harreld based on a meeting with Council on the morning of his visit and on the public forum. Second, we offer a summary of a great deal of feedback that Faculty Council has received from faculty around campus.

#### Faculty Council assessment

During Faculty Council's meeting with Mr. Harreld, Council members asked a number of questions and there was also two-way dialogue.

Some Council members noted strengths including his vision for big change and his focus on the core missions of education and research. Some felt he was personable and could potentially interact in an open and productive way with the Board of Regents. He voiced support for the role of tenured faculty. However, there were serious concerns about his ability to lead the University of Iowa, most prominently his admitted lack of university leadership experience. His answers to several questions revealed a lack of depth in understanding how a large university functions, the realities of research funding and of classroom education, and the nature of tenure and faculty governance. He also expressed a lack of understanding in the expectations and challenges of our students, and of sensitive issues of diversity and safety on campus. He brings values of business which differ in important ways from the value systems of higher education. He did not listen well and frequently dominated the conversation.

#### Faculty opinions

Although many faculty expressed regrets about the disrespectful tone of some comments in the open forum, faculty overwhelmingly expressed deep concerns about Mr. Harreld's candidacy, particularly about his lack of experience in a university leadership position. They appreciated that he directly acknowledged this issue. Nevertheless, the faculty believe such experience is essential to implement effectively any vision for transformation. This would also affect his ability to interact with and respond to the university's varied constituents. Indeed, some felt he would face great hostility and mistrust from faculty. There were also concerns about mistakes that were made in his resume and his lack of understanding of how a public university differs from a private company as well as many basic issues affecting higher education, such as Title IX.

Overall, while the faculty and Council embrace a need for positive change, there was an overwhelming consensus that Mr. Harreld would not be effective at moving the University of Iowa forward.

---

Name: Faculty Council Candidate Assessment for Krislov Company Name: University of Iowa Faculty Council Email Address: [scott-seibert@uiowa.edu](mailto:scott-seibert@uiowa.edu) Phone Number: 3193350844 Your Message: Faculty Council is a 20-member executive council of the elected Faculty Senate. This assessment is the consensus opinion of the Faculty Council based on two sources of information: our 1 hour meeting with President Krislov and observation of the open forum and feedback received by the council from faculty around the campus.

The faculty council felt that President Marvin Krislov expressed a positive and motivating vision for the University of Iowa. His strong belief in the value of a large public educational institution and the values it embodies, including access, affordability, and excellence resonated well. Dr. Krislov identified realistic strategies to move toward a top 10 status through support for fund raising in specific programs, such as medicine and engineering, multi-disciplinary challenges or "big themes" and technology transfer. He also provided convincing evidence of his strong commitment to faculty and staff shared governance, the ability to develop strong and collaborative teams and multiple levels of the institution, and a management style of constructive negotiation, delegation and empowerment. The faculty council felt that President Krislov would be particularly capable of building transparent and principled relationships with Board of Regents members, legislators, and other university presidents in Iowa. He has also demonstrated an ability to raise funds that would be very useful at UI.

President Krislov dealt sensitively with student, especially minority student concerns, during the open forum, suggesting he would be received well by a broad range of students.

Some concern among the Faculty Council were expressed regarding President Krislov's lack of experience with an institution of the size and complexity of the University of Iowa, although his experience in government and at the University of Michigan mitigated these concerns among the board members considerably. Although President Krislov expressed a sincere belief that he could make the University of Iowa better, many of his answers during the open forum focused on his values but lacked specificity. The faculty council had some concerns that President Krislov might not be the decisive decision maker and agent of institutional change required at this time.

Faculty council received comments from faculty primarily via email.

Representative comments expressed the view that President Krislov would bring "a breath of fresh air so needed in this atmosphere of dissolution and low morale." Several expressed positive reactions to his personality, including his warmth, humor, humility, willingness to listen and integrity. His JD, his breadth of experience in federal government as well as multiple roles in academic settings in Big 10 as well as a small private liberal arts college are strengths frequently commented upon. Other major strengths observed are his commitment to diversity and inclusion, his work with the local community, his depth of understanding of the issues facing higher education, his strong background in leadership positions, and ability to be a sophisticated, intelligent, energetic, and engaged President of the university.

Many commenters found no weaknesses in President Krislov. Of those that did, some expressed the view that, although he "pleaded ignorance of local conditions," such a response was appropriate since offering solutions for specific issues was not really possible. However, others felt that "he was more adept than I hoped at evading answering questions" and didn't express a clear vision specific to the University of Iowa. Several perceived that a weakness was that he did not have strong scholarly output or first-hand experience with the research enterprise of a medical school. Thus, he hadn't "offered much depth of

insight into the issues facing researchers who must seek highly competitive federal and private funding to maintain their programs of research." One representative comment felt that his "positions are fairly standard – nothing was surprising . . . his balanced approach makes great sense – except when it doesn't, and those are the crucial moments." The same individual says that s/he "wanted to hear VISION from him that was path-breaking, not retreads."

Overall, the response to President Krislov was overwhelmingly positive, with some minor reservations around the details of his vision and his ability to implement change sufficient to reinvigorate the University of Iowa.

---

Name: Faculty Council Presidential candidate feedback Company Name: University of Iowa Email Address: [tom-vaughn@uiowa.edu](mailto:tom-vaughn@uiowa.edu) Phone Number:  
Your Message:  
Joseph Steinmetz feedback

The University of Iowa Faculty Council offers the following comments on presidential candidate Joseph Steinmetz. Faculty Council is the 20-member executive council of the Faculty Senate and is made up of elected faculty representatives from all colleges at the university. Faculty Council offers two sources of faculty feedback on Dr. Steinmetz. First, we offer Faculty Council's collective summary and evaluation of Dr. Steinmetz based on a meeting with Council on the morning of his visit and on the public forum. Second, we offer a summary of feedback that Faculty Council has received from faculty around campus.

#### Faculty Council assessment

Faculty Council was overwhelmingly impressed by Dr. Steinmetz's experience, knowledge, and demonstrated aptitude for the position of President of the University of Iowa. He has progressively served in a number of administrative positions, from department chair to dean to provost in CIC institutions. He demonstrated an impressive understanding of the fiscal and operational challenges universities are facing in general, as well as familiarity with UI. He provided concrete examples from his current and former universities of things he has done or is working on to address these challenges. He was persuasive on the importance of the UI to the state, a great story that needs to be told over and over. His role as president, in part, would be to facilitate and celebrate learning and discovery. He believes all faculty, staff and students should be able to name what we do, how we do it and what the president did to achieve our goals.

Faculty council appreciated Dr. Steinmetz's philosophy in dealing with his board of trustees and the legislature, which is to educate rather than confront, and to build relationships. In doing so, he uses data to support his recommendations. In dealing with faculty, staff and students, his approach is to be transparent and collaborative. For example, he meets with a university senate comprised of faculty, administration, and students about six times per year and every policy sent to the board of trustees goes through this senate first. His track record of success includes his work combining seven humanities-oriented colleges into a single college (and reducing the number of administrators in the process). He was able to move this through shared governance with no negative votes.

Dr. Steinmetz convinced the Faculty Council of his ability to lead the UI through many specific details of his administration at Ohio State University.

He has recognized opportunities and constraints and acted for the advancement of the institution. His creation of the Discovery Themes, including one specifically dedicated to the liberal arts and humanities, indicates his interest in scholarly innovation and interdisciplinary scholarship. In addition, he presented

technical information with consideration of the perspective and relevance the information has for the audience/stakeholder. He is personable in a manner that will resonate with Iowans.

In his meeting with the faculty councilors, Dr. Steinmetz's primary question was whether faculty were ready to engage in the kind of changes that would transform the University. This resonated greatly with council members.

He was engaging, open about his priorities, and showed a sense of humor. In sum, council believes that Dr. Steinmetz would collaborate with the Regents and legislature, would work well with faculty, staff and students, would be a good ambassador for UI in the state, and would be a creative leader unafraid to take reasonable investment risks to move UI forward.

#### Faculty opinion

A number of faculty commented on Dr. Steinmetz to faculty councilors through emails and personal communication. The consistent themes were that Dr. Steinmetz has outstanding experience in and knowledge of higher education, has demonstrated a commitment to academic freedom, administrative transparency, and is committed to diversity and inclusion (though some individuals thought his responses during the town hall were not strong enough). He came across as approachable and willing to listen. His presentation style seemed to some as less polished than a couple of the other candidates, but even those who mentioned this were impressed by the substance of his remarks and answers to questions. While a few added concern that his vision statement was somewhat vague, the overwhelming majority indicated that he would be an outstanding and visionary President of the University of Iowa.