

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 5:53 AM
To: Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]
Subject: Website Query

Doesn't mean much to you I am sure but I also have no confidence in your selection of the next UI president. I see your vote as an extension of the Non educational governor's attempt to hurt Iowa's educational system even beyond secondary schools. I hope you will closely watch this man and his work at Iowa.

Sent from my iPad

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 4:54 PM
To: Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: University of Iowa President Elect

Good day,

I have written to Interim President Robillard on two separate occasions in an attempt to better understand why the Iowa Board of Regents has elected Mr. Harreld as the next president of the University of Iowa. So far I have received only a form email response that outlined what I already knew about the process by which he was elected. Since I have had zero success in figuring out what the BoR was thinking when making this selection, I have decided to write you directly. As you can tell by my email address I no longer live in Iowa, but as an alumnus of the University of Iowa (I earned both my MA and PhD at UI) I have a vested interest in seeing the University thrive.

So bare with me while I express my concerns. I firmly believe that you owe not only me, but the whole UI community satisfactory answers to the following questions.

First, given the fact that an overwhelming majority (literally over 98%) of faculty polled believe Mr. Harreld totally unqualified, how and why was this decision reached? Does this decision not fly in the face of the notion of shared governance upon which the University has functioned for its esteemed history? I respectfully ask how and why did this decision get made, and on what grounds does the Board think it rational to select a person whom the university community generally finds wildly unqualified to lead the school going forward? On what grounds was a man who falsified his resume (whether intentionally or not) not disqualified from consideration when it became clear that he had done so? And what on Earth were you thinking in hiring a man who lacks a terminal degree, who has zero experience running and extraordinarily limited experience even working at an academic institution? After his disaster of a question and answer period, where he seemed to imply that he does not know what Title IX is, where he unapologetically offended students, and refused or just didn't know how to answer questions, I want to know what further information you have about this man that led you to unanimously elect him? I'm not trying to be flippant, I am honestly looking for information because you must possess some information that I lack. Please, tell me how and why the national ridicule is misguided, because as far as everything I've seen, it seems overwhelmingly justified. So help me understand by telling me and the rest of the community what prompted this decision.

Second, while Mr. Harreld has generously extended an olive branch to the faculty and staff in asking for help learning how to run a university, I am deeply concerned by the choice to hire a man who openly admits to "having a lot to learn" at a rate significantly higher than our prior president. Regardless of how we feel about President Mason's performance, one cannot deny that she had the qualifications and experience one would expect of a university president. I cannot help but notice that Mr. Harreld, lacking in any prior experience, was hired at a rate of \$60,000 more than President Mason. At a time where women are (STILL!) frequently paid less for the work they do, this is a glaring concern. Whether Mr. Harreld's sex actually had anything to do with the decision to offer him money is not immediately relevant. Appearances being what they are, to the casual observer it would appear that white men with no experience are valued at a rate significantly higher than women who actually have relevant experience. As a proud alumnus of the University of Iowa, I want to have good reason to think that this is not the case, but at the moment I have seen no indication to the contrary. Could you offer me some reason to think that this is not the case?

Again: Why is this man being paid significantly more than the woman who preceded him? Is this unabashed sexism? If not, you need to justify to the university community how and why it's not.

Ultimately, what I am asking for is more clarity regarding not the process leading up to the decision (which has been more than sufficiently transparent), but some information regarding the actual hiring decision. That has been tremendously unclear, and I firmly believe that the university community deserves to know more about how and why this decision was made. I know that I am not alone in wanting answers, and given the recent votes, both by students and faculty at the UI, you know too.

Best,
[REDACTED]

--
[REDACTED]

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 9:40 PM
To: Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]
Subject: New UI president

As a parent of a University of Iowa student, and a graduate of Iowa State University, I am appalled by the promotion of Herrald as a candidate by Bruce Rastetter, the private phone call with Branstad, and the rapid hiring of such an unqualified candidate. Why any candidate would be even be considered with a resume that included non-truths and mis-information is troubling. These are things that should be investigated along with the cronyism within your Board of Regents. You as a Board have received numerous votes of no confidence, and I am adding mine.

I am saddened to see that republican politics have become more important than education in this state. But I should not be surprised after reading Iowa dropped to 34th in the nation in math and science. While Iowa State continues to have record enrollment due to the lack of criteria for enrollment, student loans rise and retention falls I suppose this is of no concern to you. The class sizes continue to grow and the funding decreases.

You do have a job to make sure education great in this state, however you are falling short in the pursuit of only a business model.

[REDACTED]

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2015 9:52 PM
To: Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]
Subject: Please Reconsider

To the Iowa Board of Regents,

As a University of Iowa alumni and development professional working in public education, I am saddened and troubled by the Board's decision to hire a President whom only five percent of UI constituents polled believe is fit for the position. The Board's actions seem to go so far as to treat the interests and overwhelming opinion of the students, staff, and faculty with open contempt. If you feel so strongly that you have made the right decision, than you need to do more to justify it to the people whose livelihood and education depend on your conscientious service.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 11, 2015 2:56 PM
To: Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]
Subject: Selection of Mr. Harreld as the New UI President

To the Iowa Board of Regents:

As an alumnus of the University of Iowa, I take very seriously the well being of my alma mater. And so, I am reaching out to those who might be able to help me to understand the reasoning behind what appears to be nothing short of a stain in the reputation of the University and a mark against the character of all those involved. I have previously written to both Interim President Robillard and to the Alumni association expressing my disappointment, but I also think it important to address my concerns to those directly responsible.

I am truly dismayed by the Regents' decision to hire as the next university president a man with no academic administrative experience, a man whom less than 2% of faculty consider qualified, a man who falsified his resume (which whether intentional or not is grounds for immediate disqualification from consideration), and a man who does not even have a terminal degree in his field. I am further baffled by the decision to offer this man a salary substantially higher than our prior female president who was eminently more qualified.

Interim President Robillard has said about the process, "we listened to concerns from many groups and individuals around campus and discussed issues that would affect the new president." Although it such meetings took place, it is clear that neither he nor the board took seriously the opinions of those parties who are most directly affected: the students, professors, and staff, all of whom clearly and unequivocally expressed a decided negative opinion of Mr. Harreld's ability to serve as President. This seems to undermine the very notion of shared governance which has been a cornerstone of the University and how it has functioned for its esteemed history. Perhaps if you had listened to those whose interests you were charged with representing, you might not find yourself in the position you are now in: having to defend what seems an obviously irrational choice to those whose opinions you previously dismissed and ignored.

I do not support the choice of Mr. Harreld as the new President of University of Iowa, and I have no motivation to donate any money to a University who hires a person so terribly unqualified to serve in this position. This week, it is an embarrassment to be a University of Iowa alumnus. I am in full agreement with the faculty and graduate student union statements condemning Harreld's appointment, and the vote of no confidence with the board of regents. This is nothing short of a stain on the reputation of the university. I will not be directing any future students to the University so long as Mr. Harreld remains president.

You owe the university community and the University of Iowa alumni an apology for this travesty and each of you ought personally to take any and all available active steps to undo this decision in order for the Board of Regents to save as much face as possible.

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

From:

Sent:

To:

[REDACTED]
Saturday, September 12, 2015 7:21 PM

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

As a graduate of the U of Iowa (chemistry PhD and Creative Writing MFA), I'm very disappointed in your choice of an unqualified businessman for the next president. It's as if you don't value higher education at all. The U of Iowa is successful. Its incoming class is large, smart, and diverse. Why did you do this to them? Part of my sorrow comes from my own experience with businessman David Roe as president of Central College. He left the school in debt and unable to make a class big enough to fill the facilities. Faculty left and have been difficult to replace. The college has been hit with lawsuits related to his decisions. He was a sincere man with a PhD but no academic experience. Running a college is harder than running a business. This new U of Iowa president elect must be arrogant to even think he's qualified for the job. You paid him as if he was very qualified which is also a bad stewardship decision.

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2015 5:49 AM
To: Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]
Subject: Presidential appointment

I received two graduate degrees from the University of Iowa, and have been as consistent an advocate for the excellence and probity of the university since I left with my Ph.D. in 1970.

The recent appointment of Mr. Bruce Harreld as president has left me astonished and appalled. There is, in this appointment, every appearance of political intervention, improper procedure, and worst of all, no clear recognition that universities, particularly one as fine as Iowa has been, is not a business but an educational institution.

I sincerely hope that you can find some way to extricate the university from this extremely damaging blot on its reputation.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]

From: Maggos, Nikolaos S <nikolaos-maggos@uiowa.edu>
Sent: Monday, September 14, 2015 3:24 PM
To: Lehman, Josh M [BOARD]
Subject: Board of Regents - Questions about Bruce Harreld's Selection

Hello,

As a graduate student at the University of Iowa, I have a vested interest in the success of this institution. I have had a wonderful experience at UI thus far, but am concerned about the recent selection of Bruce Harreld as the University's next president. I'm sure the Board has already received plenty of accusatory emails about how they're failing the University with their selection; I do not intend for this to be another among them. Rather, all I ask is for transparency. There were a number of obstacles to Harreld's selection: faculty and students strongly oppose Harreld's selection while strongly supporting the selection of any of the other three candidates, Harreld had false information on his CV, Harreld fared poorly (often seeming uninformed, dismissive, or combative) at the public forum, and Harreld has very little experience in higher education generally and virtually no experience at all as an administrator in higher education. Despite these obstacles, the Board of Regents unanimously voted for Harreld as UI's next president. Why? What skills, qualities, or changes is Harreld expected to bring that so greatly overshadowed the other three candidates as to merit his selection despite his many shortfalls as listed above? The Board must have reasons for selecting Harreld that are not obvious to the general University population; what are those reasons?

I look forward to your response; getting clear on these matters is extremely important to me, and I imagine to others as well.

Warm Regards,

Nikolaos S. Maggos
Philosophy PhD Student
University of Iowa