Swastikas, Hate and Confusion

April 27, 2015

By Scott Jaschik

A student disciplinary process at George Washington University might not seem like hot news in India, but this weekend it was receiving attention in The Times of India, The Hindustan Times and elsewhere.

The case is being interpreted by some law professors as a move by the university to effectively ban the swastika from the university's campus. And the reason the case is attracting interest in India is that a student who posted a swastika on a fraternity bulletin board was Jewish -- and the symbol he posted was not a Nazi one, but something he had picked up on a trip to India to learn more about religions there, including some that used the swastika as a holy symbol for centuries before the Nazis adopted it.

As shown in the illustration above, the Nazi swastika was typically black on white, surrounded by red, on a 45-degree angle. Those of Eastern religions typically feature horizontal and vertical lines, sometimes with dots added and different color arrangements.

The dispute at George Washington comes as a number of colleges have in the last year responded to swastikas on campuses -- sometimes with Jewish students or organizations as the apparent target. A freshman at the University of Missouri at Columbia was arrested last week for a swastika graffiti and anti-Semitic vandalism. Numerous other campuses have reported swastika incidents in the current academic year. Among them: Emory University, the University of California at Davis and Northwestern University.

In those and many other cases, the swastikas were (regardless of what one thinks of hate speech regulations) acts of vandalism, sometimes at Jewish organizations, and so were clearly violations of university rules and/or local laws simply because people don't have the legal right to deface property that is not their own. That was also the case with a series of swastikas at GW this year (before the case of the student who picked up a swastika in India).
Some Jewish organizations have criticized some colleges and universities for not responding strongly enough (in the view of these groups) to swastika vandalism. Nineteen organizations wrote to GW President Stephen Knapp, saying he had not done enough, in March, after the first round of swastikas on campus this year. Then came the student who returned from India. He put the swastika on the bulletin board of his fraternity (Zeta Beta Tau, a historically Jewish fraternity), and another student saw it and reported the swastika to the university before getting an explanation. As officials investigated, the student (whose name hasn't been revealed) came forward and said that he had been hoping to have a conversation about the symbol and did not intend to offend anyone. He stressed that this was an Indian swastika, not a Nazi one. The student has told people that while in India, he became fascinated by the idea that a symbol that was not one of hate could become so defined by hate, and that he wanted to explore this issue.

The student has been suspended and banned from campus and a hearing was held last week over his actions. He could face expulsion.

Knapp issued a statement after the ZBT swastika incident that two GW law professors say raises serious legal issues for the university.

"A member of Zeta Beta Tau has now admitted posting the swastika, which he says he acquired while traveling in India over spring break. While the student claims his act was not an expression of hatred, the university is referring the matter to the [police] for review by its hate crimes unit," Knapp said. "Since its adoption nearly a century ago as the symbol of the Nazi Party, the swastika has acquired an intrinsically anti-Semitic meaning, and therefore the act of posting it in a university residence hall is utterly unacceptable. Our entire community should be aware of the swastika’s association with genocide perpetrated against the Jewish people and should be concerned about the extremely harmful effects that displaying this symbol has on individuals and on the climate of our entire university community."

John Banzhaf, a law professor at GW who is backing the student but does not represent him, said that many people should be concerned by Knapp making it university policy that the student's intent is irrelevant. Banzhaf said he believed that many swastikas are illegal and a violation of university rules either because they constitute vandalism or are attempts to intimidate Jewish students. But that wasn't the case here.

Under the interpretation outlined by Knapp, Banzhaf said, a student from India with a swastika in his room would be violating the university's rules and could fear suspension or expulsion. Banzhaf also said it was important not to judge actions by their potential to offend, if the meaning was being misconstrued. As an example, he said that if a student or professor used the word "niggardly" and someone thought that person was using the racial slur, the person could be charged with a hateful act -- without ever having had that intent -- under Knapp's philosophy.

Jonathan Turley, another GW law professor, has written a blog post questioning whether the student who posted the swastika could be seen as having committed a hate crime when he committed no crime, since posting something on a bulletin board is legal.
The Hindu American Foundation is also calling on GW to withdraw the president's statement and to stop seeking to punish the student who posted a swastika from India. "Contrary to the hateful and violent meaning the swastika has come to take on for many since its misappropriation by the Nazis, the original swastika is an ancient and holy symbol. It is still commonly used at the entrance of Hindu homes, in temples, and on invitations to special occasions such as weddings and other rites of passage. The four limbs of the Hindu swastika have diverse symbolic meanings: the four Vedas (Hindu holy texts); the four stages of life; the four goals of life; the four Yugas (eras); the four seasons; and the four directions. As such, the symbol cannot be dismissed as one of 'intrinsically anti-Semitic meaning,'" said a letter from the foundation to GW.

The letter added: "Furthermore, we are highly concerned with your attempt to expel the student who posted the symbol without any attempt to understand the context of his actions. The consequences of the university’s expulsion could very well be a de facto ban on the use of the swastika in any context on campus. As such, Hindu, Buddhist, Jain or Native American students who sought to use the symbol in a religious manner would be unable to do so without facing the risk of punishment. Such consequences violate both federal and D.C. law and call into question your commitment to religious diversity on campus."

A spokesperson for George Washington said via email that the university did not comment on individual cases. But she said it was not true that GW had banned any symbol. "The university has not banned nor is it attempting to ban religious symbols," she said. "Student organizations and individual students are free to examine and to discuss all questions of interest to them and to express opinions publicly and privately. They are free to support causes by orderly means that do not disrupt the regular and essential operation of the institution."

Nepalese students at MU, Westminster spend anxious weekend waiting for word from home

By Roger McKinney

Monday, April 27, 2015 at 2:00 pm

Nepalese students at the University of Missouri and Westminster College endured an anxiety-filled weekend as they watched the aftermath of a major disaster in their homeland from afar.
On Monday many of those students said their families back home were living in tents after an earthquake Saturday killed more than 4,000 people.

Some students said their families in Kathmandu, the country’s capital, were surviving on very little food and water. Rain is complicating rescue and relief efforts.

Nila Manandhar is a fourth-year medical student at MU and a member of the Nepalese Student Association. She said when she woke up Saturday morning, she saw posts on social media websites about the earthquake in her homeland. Manandhar began calling and texting her family members. After a few hours, she received a one-word text from an uncle that her family was fine.

“They’re all safe,” Manandhar said. “The main problem is ... finding food and water.”

Manandhar said most of her family members and others in Kathmandu were staying outside in tents, fearing their homes could collapse as a result of the strong aftershocks.

“It’s been raining very heavily,” she said. “There’s no power and almost no water. There’s very little to eat right now.”

Manandhar said there was little medical infrastructure in Nepal before the earthquake, and because of the lack of adequate medical care, many of the injured have died.

Saroj Dhital, a graduate student in economics at MU and a member of the Nepalese student group, said his parents were visiting a remote rural area when the earthquake struck.

“The entire village was buried” where his parents were visiting, Dhital said. His family members escaped unharmed and made their way back to Kathmandu.

Dhital said the more remote areas of the country were the worst hit. “My mom said she saw a lot of dead bodies walking on the way back,” he said.

He said Nepal’s economy always has been weak but was showing signs of growth before the earthquake.

“I’m pretty sure it’s going to take years to recover — half a decade or a decade,” Dhital said. “Our political system is not very good. Things are not looking very good for Nepal right now.”

Dhital and some of the other Nepalese students said those wanting to help should send money, not supplies, and donate to established, trusted charities, including Red Cross, Oxfam and the World Food Programme.

Nepalese students at Westminster College who are part of a group called Making Lives Better have started an online fundraiser, the Nepal Earthquake Relief Fund, on a crowd-funding website at www.gofundme.com/swr25w. The effort had raised $2,320 Monday morning, with a goal of $5,000.
Mahima Poudel, a Nepalese student studying political science and international economic development at Westminster, said she was unable to talk to her parents until Sunday night, but they are safe.

“They’re just in a state of shock and fear and confusion in general,” Poudel said. “Everyone is in a state of panic.”

Poudel said her parents sleep in their car. An aunt’s house collapsed, but she also wasn’t injured. Poudel said the government is responding with all its meager resources.

“The sense of community is very strong at the moment” among the Nepalese people, Poudel said.

She said there’s not enough clean drinking water or food. There are reports of people suffering from hypothermia from sleeping on the cold ground. She said she fears the emergence of waterborne diseases.

Poudel said many historic Buddhist sites that are thousands of years old have been destroyed.

“We have lost almost all of our historic monuments,” she said.

But Poudel said she has been overwhelmed by the support she has received.
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MU's Nepalese students emphasize relief needs
Monday, April 27, 2015 | 11:09 p.m. CDT; updated 12:33 a.m. CDT, Tuesday, April 28, 2015
BY KATIE AKIN

COLUMBIA — After a 7.8 magnitude earthquake devastated parts of Nepal, some MU students are looking to their community and the world to help send relief to the South Asian country.

MU medical school student Nila Manandhar woke up early Saturday morning and found out about the earthquake through Facebook, but she wasn't able to speak with her family in Nepal for more than a day because of how frantic the area was after the quake. On Sunday, she found out that her family was unharmed, but their homes were destroyed. They were living mostly under tarps because there are no real tents available.
“I have 5-year-old cousins who have been pretty traumatized by what they have seen,” Manandhar said.

Manandhar said she knew Nepal was prone to disasters, but she was shocked when she heard about the quake. The quake’s epicenter was located 50 miles northwest of Kathmandu, the country's largest city and capital. The death toll has reached more than 4,300.

“I always knew it was going to come, but I never expected it to be Saturday,” Manandhar said.

MU doctoral student Khem Aryal’s parents were on the way to Kathmandu to apply for visas so they could attend his graduation in May when the earthquake struck. They had to cancel their trip and return to his brother’s home, which was not badly affected by the quake due to its location outside the city.

A friend of Aryal’s, however, flew back to Kathmandu on Monday to support his family. Druba Bhattarai, a visiting scholar at MU, cut his time in United States short after his two sons were injured during the earthquake.

Aryal and Bhattarai were in Lexington, Kentucky, when Aryal’s wife called him early Saturday morning to tell him about the quake. As Bhattarai told Aryal, his boys were playing in the street when two high walls — which Aryal believes were not up to disaster-safe standards — collapsed on them. Aryal has not heard about the boys' conditions.

Aryal had worked at the Red Cross and said he understood immediately the impact that a 7.8 magnitude-quake could have.

“It was crippling when I heard the scale of the quake,” Aryal said. “It is very necessary that we think about supporting the effort to relieve Nepal.”

Many major humanitarian groups, including Oxfam and the Red Cross, have started relief efforts for Nepal. Aryal, who has already donated to the Red Cross, said he believes these relief efforts are the key to helping the country cope with the effects of its worst earthquake in 80 years.

Manandhar said the focus that she and some members of MU’s Nepalese Student Association have is on sending money to established relief organizations who were already on the ground in Nepal, rather than sending supplies themselves.
Manu Bhandari, an MU doctoral student, said about 25 people whose homes have been destroyed are living on the lawn of his home in Kathmandu. Bhandari said though media attention has been focused on Kathmandu, there is a large need for relief in more remote areas.

“The problems outside Kathmandu, especially in some hard-hit districts and villages, have been extremely bad," Bhandari said in an email. "Almost whole villages have been destroyed."

Nepalese people in Columbia have many concerns related to the effects of the earthquake in addition to the immediate devastation. Theft, disease and safety top the list.

“There are some immediate concerns about looting and theft," Bhandari said. "We are also worried about the aid funds being used properly."

Manandhar said people should be wary in the upcoming days and months of an outbreak of disease with everyone living in close quarters. And Aryal said he believes a major focus of repairing the country should be creating disaster-safe buildings and enforcing strict building codes.

“We cannot have buildings collapsing on children,” Aryal said.

The Nepalese Student Association plans to donate funds to established relief organizations like the Red Cross or UNICEF. They also have plans to create fundraisers and hold a candlelight vigil in Columbia as soon as possible.

Native Nepal Mizzou students fundraising for homeland

Watch story: http://www.komu.com/player/?video_id=28614&zone=5&categories=5
COLUMBIA - Students at the University of Missouri are raising money to help those in Nepal following the earthquake. These Mizzou students are all from Nepal.

Nineteen students met at MU’s Student Center Monday evening to discuss ways to raise money throughout the campus and community.

Raghav Poudyal, a fifth year PhD student, said the group plans to begin fundraising this week. He said they plan to use online resources as well as setting up tables around campus.

"We will start Facebook pages, we will start PayPal accounts, we'll try to reach as many people as we can," he said.

Poudyal said money isn't getting to the right places at this time despite people in Nepal wanting to help. He said they plan to pass the money they raise along to organizations such as the Red Cross that are already in Nepal and directly help residents.

Most of the students said they have been keeping in touch with family members despite the horrible conditions.

"Although most of our family members are alive and OK, the city is not. The country is not." Poudyal said. "There are villages that have been wiped off. There are lots of people that need help right now."

He said the aftershocks of the earthquake have been so frequent that people are scared to go back into their homes. With rain and other weather elements, Poudyal said they need help immediately so speed is key.

Poudyal said they plan on hosting a candlelight vigil in the next few days to help raise money and he encourages everyone to join in the effort to raise funds.

Mizzou student’s family impacted by Nepal Earthquake

COLUMBIA, MO -- The University of Missouri has 27 students who call Nepal home. Family of some of those students were impacted by last Saturday’s 7.8 magnitude earthquake.
Suman Gurung is from a town less than 100 miles from epicenter of the earthquake. He said his town has a lot of old palaces and temples which have been destroyed, but the newer buildings have some cracks and damage, but are in much better shape.

Gurung told KRCG 13 his family is still in a state of panic and are afraid to go back inside buildings. Because of this, they are living in a field in a large tent.

He said the people impacted need a lot of supplies like medicine, clean water and food.

Gurung explained that Nepal wasn’t prepared, nor equipped to handle such a large earthquake. He said his country needs help from outside counties.

“For the place where it's been hit hard, we definitely need more people to help find the victims. We need more technology to help locate [the victim] because we are definitely not equipped with all the technologies to locate the victims.”

Gurung and other Mizzou students from Nepal are working on a way to raise money to send back to their home country.

Lincoln University is also helping to raise money. Students will be putting donation boxes in several businesses on campus as well as at Everest Café on Missouri Boulevard.

LU students will also be holding a fundraising rally this Saturday morning in front of the capital from 8 to 10. The money LU raises will be given to the Red Cross.
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CARL KENNEY: Time to talk about race
Tuesday, April 28, 2015 | 6:00 a.m. CDT
BY CARL W. KENNEY
It’s time to talk about race.

The MU Faculty Council on Race Relations will hold a public meeting on Wednesday.

Expect a room filled with angry students. Expect promises followed by demands that remind you of the movie “Groundhog Day.” Those who have been around for more than five years will think it’s the same script and dynamics that leave you feeling it’s the same day – over and over again.
The critical question facing MU is how to end this miserable, vicious cycle of death. As some endorse a plan to force professors to engage in diversity training, others are left seeking what has been on the table since I was an undergraduate student at MU back in the '80s.

Show me the faculty, followed by where are the black students?

Expect to hear the common excuse used to justify failures in hiring black faculty and in addressing a black student enrollment that hovers around 7 percent. They can’t find qualified professors and students.

That’s offensive; that’s wrong. No, that’s a lie.

There are numerous black students and faculty out there. They refuse to come to MU because of a culture that undergirds life on campus for black people. It doesn’t help that Columbia lacks the type of diversity that reminds people of "Soul Train" and saying it loud like you’re black and proud.

A culture of white supremacy is too deeply engrained to offset with courses interwoven within the curriculum. Required is an analysis of how racism shows up in ways beyond the normal assumptions we make.

“Racism is an integral, permanent, and indestructible component of this society,” Derrick Bell writes in “Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism.”

Bell, who was dismissed by Harvard University from his position as Weld Professor of Law for refusing to end his two-year leave protesting the lack of minority women on the faculty, argued racism continues because white people gain too much to end its grip on blacks.

Bell warned, before his death in 2011, against the seduction of racial symbols.

“From the Emancipation Proclamation on, the Man been handing us a bunch of bogus freedom checks he never intends to honor,” Semple, one of Bell’s fictitious characters, said in his book. “He makes us work, plead, and pray for them, and then when he has you either groveling or threatening to tear his damn head off, he lets you have them as though they were some kind of special gift.”

What are symbols?
Symbols, according to Bell, are the holiday for Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., the integration of public schools, the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the election of Barack Obama as the first black president and other acts that give hope. They leave people inspired enough to stop marching and singing about overcoming someday.

They are a bogus check.

It’s a dreadful conclusion that has people lined up to invalidate Bell’s thesis. What about the success of black people who serve as examples that America has become a colorblind country? Can’t we now, after considerable work toward undoing the mean-spirited ways of George Wallace, Bill Connor and others determined to keep black people on their side of the tracks, assume all forms of disparity are the fault of those too lazy to overcome?

Can we point to the successes of a few as evidence of the failures of the masses? Is Bell right in suggesting that white supremacy is the primary barrier in overcoming the prevalence of racism?

More to the point, are MU’s problems related to identifying, hiring, nurturing and maintaining black faculty caused by a culture rooted in notions of white supremacy?

Bell goes on to say blacks are chosen who reject their blackness, show little concern for black students and distance themselves from political views held by most blacks.

You can’t be too black to make it in a world dominated by whites.

Is that the problem at MU?

Does one have to become a token of black success to maintain a place within the world of white privilege? Is it enough to have a few blacks in the room to represent those not able to sit at the table? What happens when you bring up black issues? Do you take the risk of being considered irrelevant for being too black, or being minimized because the others at the table assume you don’t deserve to be in the room?

These are gut-wrenching questions that deserve consideration before moving forward with an agenda instead of revisiting the same issues over and over again. MU has to face its unwillingness to address the absence of blacks on campus and how a culture of racism undermines reversing these trends.
Sadly, I agree with Bell’s thesis. Disparities in black student enrollment and black faculty appointments are impacted by a culture that bolsters notions of white supremacy. These impressions are fed by stereotypes that claim a void in black scholarship and intelligence. It’s an assessment guided by labels that pit assumptions of white intellectual supremacy against black insufficiency.

The faculty council has a long way to go before shifting the culture that feeds racial tension at MU. If Bell is right, what can we do to prove him wrong?

You have to begin by talking about race.

---

**MU Receives $1 Million Gift to Support Journalism Education on LGBT Issues**

Listen to the KMOX radio (St. Louis) story: [http://mms.tveyes.com/PlaybackPortal.aspx?SavedEditID=c095356d-e6df-43c6-902f-152bd0e3e404](http://mms.tveyes.com/PlaybackPortal.aspx?SavedEditID=c095356d-e6df-43c6-902f-152bd0e3e404)

---

**Editorial: Mike Alden**

The beginning of a new career

By Henry J. Waters III

Monday, April 27, 2015 at 2:00 pm

**University of Missouri Athletic Director Mike Alden served his last day on the job Sunday. He leaves after 17 years in one of the most stressful jobs on campus for what will surely be a more comfortable tenure in the College of Education.**
Spread across several pages of our Sunday edition, Sports Editor Joe Walljasper and reporter David Morrison recounted Alden’s time in Tiger athletics.

As athletic director, Alden had a tumultuous time with notable ups and downs. Clearly, at the end of the day, the ups prevail. Walljasper gave a timeline of events that, taken as a whole, give a picture of accomplishment. The value of facilities grew a lot. Overall quality of team performance became better. MU athletes outperform most of their peers in academic accomplishment. The program transferred successfully to the Southeastern Conference, bringing fame and fortune – and not least proving Mizzou could compete with supposedly superior teams in the SEC. Non-revenue-producing sports such as softball and wrestling have gotten better.

On another page, Morrison did a reflective profile of Alden, the person, including several rather moving testimonials from people who know him best. At the end of it all, I believe we can conclude though Alden presided over a few unhappy moments in Mizzou athletic history, all the while he was and is an ethical and successful operator who deserved sincere and loving admiration from his closest allies.

I never knew Mike well enough to be classified as a confidant. When we met occasionally, I always enjoyed his personality and never thought he was dissembling. During one particularly rough spot when a number of local citizens became openly critical and his job tenure was in jeopardy, Alden and I talked about the need for him to reach out, to make appointments with the most outspoken dissidents to listen more than explain. In the ensuing weeks, he used his personality and inherent good intent to ease his way back into general acceptance. He learned, I think, the value of slowing down his rhetoric a bit.

Support from then-Chancellor Brady Deaton was the essential factor allowing Alden to regroup and finish strong.

When Alden announced his pending retirement, many of us immediately wondered if the decision was entirely voluntary. A decisive new chancellor had arrived on campus. R. Bowen Loftin has a particularly strong background in athletic management. He had personally engineered Texas A&M into the SEC. Loftin has the kind of personality that demands results – particularly in athletics, one can assume. Even if not an explicit quid pro quo, we thought Alden might have seen some sort of writing on the wall, accelerating his decision to move to the College of Education.

But in the weeks since, augmented by revelations in Morrison’s profile, I believe Alden and his wife, Rockie, were ready for the change before Loftin arrived. Alden is an emotional guy. Retirement is bittersweet. He shed a few tears, but not because he had been fired. The change in career is fully embraced by Alden himself.

Circumstances require the arrival of a new athletic director. Mack Rhoades begins today where Alden is leaving off. With the appointment of Rhoades, Chancellor Loftin suddenly makes his own mark. Alden leaves the department in good shape. Rhoades shows promise of grabbing the baton without missing a step. Loftin hovers over all, surely pleased at how things are working out.
At age 56, Mike Alden can look back at a pleasingly successful life so far. He has faced controversy. How else could it be for a person in such a prominent, fraught position? But as the smoke clears, he can be proud of himself and what he accomplished for the university.

First-round prospect Shane Ray cited for marijuana possession

NFL draft prospect Shane Ray was cited for marijuana possession Monday morning in Missouri, according to police records from the Missouri State Police.

Ray, widely projected as a first-round pick, was cited and charged with possession of less than 35 grams of marijuana and failure to drive in the right lane of a highway with two or more lanes.

The arrest occurred in Cooper County, Missouri, which is located between Ray's hometown of Kansas City and Columbia, where he attended the University of Missouri.

Possession of under 35 grams of marijuana is a misdemeanor in Missouri, punishable by up to one year in prison and a $1,000 fine.

Ray apologized for his actions in a statement, saying "there no excuses here and I will take the necessary steps to ensure this will not happen again."

"I’d like to apologize to my Mother, Fans and prospective NFL teams for my poor judgment Monday morning," Ray said. "I am embarrassed and realize there are consequences for my actions. I was not under the influence nor impaired, therefore I was not detained. Fortunately, Mondays incident only resulted in a citation. I will make better choices in the future."

Ray, a pass-rushing outside linebacker, was ranked the No. 18 prospect in this year's draft class by SI.com's Doug Farrar and Chris Burke. Ray declared for the draft after his junior season, where he was named the SEC Defensive Player of the Year after recording a conference-high 14.5 sacks.

He is scheduled to be in attendance this week at the draft in Chicago.
COLUMBIA, Mo. • Three days before he’s expected to be a first-round pick in the NFL draft, Missouri defensive end Shane Ray was arrested Monday morning on suspicion of marijuana possession during a search of his car on Interstate 70, Missouri Highway Patrol officer Scott White said Monday.

Ray, 21, was pulled over for speeding in his Chrysler 300 at 5:46 a.m. in Cooper County while driving alone westbound on I-70. The officer detected the odor of marijuana and while searching Ray's car found a small personal amount of marijuana in a compartment.

Ray was cited for possession of up to 35 grams of marijuana, which is a Class A misdemeanor and punishable by up to a year in jail and a $1,000 fine. He also was cited for failing to drive in the right lane of a highway with two or more lanes, a Class C misdemeanor. Ray was issued a warning for speeding.

Ray did not appear to be impaired and was cooperative with the officer, White said. Ray was released on a signature summons. He faces a June 30 court date in Cooper County.

UPDATE: Former Missouri star football player Shane Ray arrested

Monday, April 27, 2015 | 9:16 p.m. CDT; updated 12:55 a.m. CDT, Tuesday, April 28, 2015

BY AARON REISS

COLUMBIA — Former Missouri defensive end Shane Ray was arrested Monday morning in Cooper County for possession of marijuana and failure to drive in the right lane of a highway with two or more lanes.

According to Cpl. Scott White of the Missouri State Highway Patrol, a trooper pulled Ray over for speeding westbound down Interstate 70 at mile marker 109 at 5:46 a.m.
White said the trooper ultimately stopped Ray at mile marker 108, at which point the trooper could smell the odor of marijuana that was not burning.

White said the odor gave way to a probable cause search, and the trooper found a “personal amount” of marijuana inside the vehicle. Ray was alone in the car and not under the influence, White said.

He was released on his own recognizance, according to White.

White said the trooper gave Ray a warning for his speeding and citations for possession of up to 35 grams of marijuana and failure to drive in the right lane. The marijuana charge is a Class A misdemeanor, and the other citation is a traffic charge.

Ray has a June 30 court date in Cooper County, White said.

Ray was last season’s Southeastern Conference Defensive Player of the Year as a junior. Most draft projections have him as a first-round pick in the NFL draft, which begins Thursday.

Ray’s 14.5 sacks last season broke the Missouri program’s single-season record. He declared for the NFL draft with one season of eligibility remaining.

Delinquent. Dropout. At-Risk. What's In A Name?

Much of our recent reporting, especially from New Orleans, has focused on young people who are neither in school, nor working. There are an estimated five and a half million of them, ages 16 to 24, in the United States.

But what do we call them? The nomenclature has fluctuated widely over the decades. And each generation’s preferred term is packed with assumptions—economic, social, cultural, and educational — about the best way to frame the issue. Essentially, each name contains an argument about who’s at fault, and where to find solutions.
"I think the name matters," says Andrew Mason, the executive director of Open Meadow, an alternative school in Portland, Oregon. "If we're using disparaging names, people are going to have a hard time thinking that you're there to help kids."

Mason has worked in alternative education for more than 23 years and he's seen these terms evolve over time.

To delve deeper into just how much the taxonomy has changed, I used Google's Ngram Viewer tool to track mentions of some of the most popular phrases in published books. I started at the year 1940. Back then, the prevailing term was:

**Juvenile Delinquent**

This is among the oldest terms used to describe this category of young people. It was originally identified with a reformist, progressive view that sought special treatment for them, outside of adult prisons. It lumped together youth who broke a law, "wayward" girls who got pregnant or young people who were simply homeless.

The New York House of Refuge, founded in 1825, has been called the first institution designated exclusively to serve such youth. An 1860 article in *The New York Times* described its mission as "the reformation of juvenile delinquents."

This was the beginning of the "reform school," aka "industrial school" movement. The primary response to young people in these situations was to institutionalize them, sometimes for years, with varying levels of access to food, shelter, work and education. Meanwhile, the first designated juvenile court was established in 1899 in Cook County, Illinois.

The Ngram graph shows rising interest in "juvenile delinquents" throughout the 1950s and 1960s — reflected in pop culture images like *West Side Story* and *Rebel Without A Cause*. A series of Supreme Court cases in the late '60s and early '70s established that courts could not have carte blanche in institutionalizing young defendants; their rights should be similar to those of adults.

Nell Bernstein, a journalist who has written several books about juvenile justice, points out that the term "juvenile" is more commonly used to refer to animals than people. "I have two teenage children, but I don't call them juveniles," she says. "It's dehumanizing."

** Dropout**

The concept of a high school dropout was nonsensical through the early 20th century. That's because so few people graduated high school in the first place. There was a concerted government effort to increase high school enrollment through the Great Depression. But graduation rates topped 50 percent of the population only by 1940.

As we can see here, the drumbeat about a "dropout crisis" rose steeply in the 1960s and reached a peak in the early 1970s. Part of that was due to demographics. The Baby Boom had subsided into
a "birth dearth," and enrollment was flattening for the first time in U.S. history. In the meantime, the economic benefits of an education continued to grow.

Bernstein says that in her experience, the rise in use of the term dropout was tied to psychedelic pioneer Timothy Leary's famous slogan, "turn on, tune in, drop out."

This image of dropping out as a cultural or social choice has persisted, she says. "When I did research on homeless youth, there was a strong misconception that they were '60s style dropouts who had left in pursuit of freedom and because they couldn't do as many drugs at home."

Bernstein favors also using the term "pushout," which, she says, "opens up the possibility that the onus isn't entirely on the dropout," and "looks at root causes." In our New Orleans reporting we often found people talking about students getting "pushed out" of school.

Concern about dropouts soared again in the 1990s. In 1990, President George H.W. Bush set a national goal of cutting the dropout rate to 10 percent.

However, says Russell Rumberger, director of the California Dropout Research Project at UC Santa Barbara, high school graduation rates kept declining, to a modern-day low of 69 percent by 2002.

It has since rebounded to an all-time high.

But, he says, "I worry about emphasis on this one statistic, because it masks variations that are quite important." He cites a Brookings Institution study that says, in order to raise your chances of becoming middle class by age 40, it's necessary to avoid jail, avoid becoming pregnant as a teen and pass high school with at least a 2.5 GPA.

At-Risk Youth

The term "at-risk youth" gained currency in the wake of the 1983 publication of the policy report A Nation At Risk. The report cautioned that America's way of life was threatened by a "rising tide of mediocrity" within the school system. The term "at-risk" suggests a focus on prevention and intervention, in the form of social services, tutoring and related programs. According to the Ngram, it seems to have risen in popularity just as "juvenile delinquent" declined.

"Delinquent" conjures a state of being, while "at-risk" suggests a vulnerable person in need of help. A scholarly paper by Margaret Placier at the University of Missouri-Columbia argues that "at-risk" became a "buzzword" because it was vague enough to be defined broadly or narrowly, depending on the purpose. But Bernstein and Mason both point out that "at risk" also focuses on the negative.

Superpredator

A 1995 article by John J. Dilulio Jr., a professor and author with appointments at Princeton University, the Brookings Institution, and the Manhattan Institute, was titled, "THE COMING
OF THE SUPER — PREDATORS." It predicted a rising tide of youth violence: a burgeoning generation of homicidal thugs without a conscience, "elementary school youngsters who pack guns instead of lunches," found "in black inner-city neighborhoods." The culprits, Dilulio wrote, were drugs, child abuse and other types of "moral poverty."

The concept caught on in the media and among politicians. In the 1990s, as part of a broader "tough on crime" trend, almost every state passed laws that raised the number of young people being tried as adults. But the promised boom in youth crime never arrived — in fact, by the ’90s, juvenile offenses had begun to level off, and today they are at their lowest rates ever.

When Gina Womack founded Families And Friends Of Louisiana's Incarcerated Children, an advocacy group, 17 years ago, she had to contend with the image of the aggressive, incorrigible "superpredator." Gradually, she says, it faded. "Kids were thought of, and talked about, as children, and not so much as these horrible monsters."

Bernstein calls the superpredator stereotype "absurd and devastating ... an insult you can't take back." She points out that, like juvenile, it compares people to animals. As the Ngram chart shows, the word never really went away.

**Opportunity Youth**

Opportunity youth is a phrase of such recent vintage, it doesn't show up in a Google book search.

John Bridgeland, CEO of Civic Enterprises, a public-policy firm in Washington, D.C., coined the term in a 2012 report. It was created with support from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (which funds education coverage among other areas at NPR.) Bridgeland had previously authored a national survey and report on dropouts, titled *The Silent Epidemic*.

"I'm not one to paper over reality or hardship," he says. "I don't like buzzterms or jargon." But in talking with young people in these situations, he says, he saw "Extraordinary untapped potential ... They saw the benefits of finishing school and getting a decent job. They were extremely hopeful, notwithstanding their challenges. My bottom line was, If they can be hopeful, why can't we?"

Bridgeland's "opportunity" had a second meaning. He commissioned economic calculations of the social costs of these young people, as measured in lost wages and increased use of social services."They cost the economy and our society $93 billion every year," he says. "If you're not compelled by the moral, individual argument, maybe the economic argument will wake you up."

The Aspen Institute, among others, has funded "opportunity youth" initiatives that seek to bring together schools, community groups, foster care programs, family court and the juvenile justice system to help young people find their way back.

"Some folks who do this work like it. Some don't," Melissa Sawyer, whose Youth Empowerment Project serves this population in New Orleans, says of the "opportunity youth" catchphrase. It can be seen as empowering, she says, or condescending. "At one level, it's semantics."
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As colleges across the country attempt to navigate tough economic times and respond to calls to change their business models, conflicts abound. They are about not only the substance of various strategies, but about the ways administrators and faculty communicate during an era of sweeping change in how the business side of universities operate.

Both large and small, colleges around the country are working to adapt to a changing financial landscape.

Whether that's streamlining operations and asking fewer people to do more work, cutting benefits or slowing salary hikes, or determining how to grapple with declining enrollment and growing discount rates, the result is colleges everywhere are looking for ways to shrink their recurring costs.

Faculty members often bristle at the ways colleges attempt to cut those costs, either because they feel the logic is not sound -- such as when a group of Harvard University professors protested benefit changes last year, saying the cuts wouldn’t save as much money as administrators claimed -- or because they believe the proposed changes don't align with the mission of a college.

As more and more faculty resolutions against strategic plans and administrative actions surface, nearly all of them have a common thread: concern over not only the proposed changes, but how those changes are communicated.

Often faculty members decry a lack of transparency or consultation. Sometimes their concerns are as simple as the vocabulary administrators use.

At King’s College, a small Roman Catholic college in Pennsylvania, minutes from a faculty benefits meeting caused concern among a wide swath of the faculty when the chief financial officer was recorded as saying the college invests in buildings


because there's a return on investment, whereas there's no such return on increasing faculty salaries. The CFO, John Loyack, claims the minutes are inaccurate, and he was instead talking about how the college couldn't use restricted capital fund donations on operating expenses such as salaries.

Clearly there was a disconnect between the four faculty members present during the meeting, who unanimously passed the minutes, which have since been amended, and the financial officer. “That conversation never happened,” he said in an email.

The disconnect, offered one faculty leader at the college, could be due to the different ways administrators and faculty communicate. Margarita Rose, an economics professor and the chair of the Faculty Council at King's, said the college has experienced “a couple of challenging years in terms of budgets and there's a fair amount of frustration among faculty.”

“There are other institutions where there is this tension, and there's an expectation sometimes that the financial officer will have the same language and understanding as the academic administration and faculty,” Rose said. “Perhaps that's an unfair expectation since we don't always use language the same way.”

King's is far from alone.

“There seems to be... a simmering level of mistrust between faculty and administrators,” said Stacy Cordery, a history professor at Monmouth College, in Illinois. “When there are fiscal contractions, the mistrust seems to increase a relative size to the fiscal concern. When times grow lean, people become more possessive of what they have.”

She continued, “The worst thing the administration can do is to stop communicating, to shut down and not make any attempt to communicate with the faculty.... That sounds simple, I know, but when you live through it, it's miserable.”

There’s an expectation sometimes that the financial officer will have the same language and understanding as the academic administration and faculty. Perhaps that’s an unfair expectation since we don’t always use language the same way. -- Margarita Rose, chair of the faculty leadership at King’s College.

**Transparency**

The debates over communication or the lack thereof come as many college administrators and politicians believe it's time for new funding models and new approaches to higher education.

“The season that we’re in, and have been in for a while, is putting even greater pressure on various constituencies to be really clear in their communications. This is a moment where greater clarity and transparency is absolutely essential,” said Ron Mahurin, vice president for strategy and planning at Stamats, a higher education consulting firm. “Everyone at many levels understands what is at stake here -- the fact that there is such scrutiny on higher education right now around cost, affordability and sustainability.”
Richard Kneedler, president emeritus of Franklin & Marshall College, said that administrators are acutely aware of faculty resistance to changes in how universities operate.

“The fundamental question is whether one is so concerned about tension that one tries to avoid having the conversation until all relevant decisions have been made and the whole package can be announced,” he said. “The choice is either to have these conversations as a regular part of campus life, or to be confronted episodically with unwelcome announcements of various sorts that make people feel excluded from a decision process.”

The season that we’re in, and have been in for a while, is putting even greater pressure on various constituencies to be really clear in their communications. This is a moment where greater clarity and transparency is absolutely essential. -- Ron Mahurin, vice president of Stamats.

For example, at the University of Michigan last year, faculty members protested a plan to consolidate the college’s administrative functions and eliminate positions. The university’s Faculty Senate and the faculty governing body of its largest college each passed resolutions against the initiative. Faculty members contended that the program would not save as much money as administrators claimed, and cited a lack of transparency and faculty input in its development. The university temporarily put the project on hold as a result.

“That was a case where it was known that this was going to be confrontational, and rather than explaining what the benefits were and confronting the concerns and questions, an individual thought it would be a better strategy just to cut that process out because it was going to be difficult,” said Scott Masten, head of Michigan’s faculty governance. “Of course, it was worse not being up front about it.”

In 2014, business school faculty members at St. Joseph’s College in Philadelphia voted no confidence in the college’s president, in part because of the perception that they were “deprived... of the opportunity to contribute meaningfully” to budget changes at the college because of financial constraints. Also that year, faculty members at Connecticut’s regional universities and community colleges pushed back on a plan to overhaul the state’s university system, claiming that they weren't giving an opportunity to help develop the new plan. Faculty and administrators at the University of Southern Maine sparred for more than a year over cutbacks and layoffs.

Macalester College, a liberal arts college in Minnesota, has frozen salaries and undergone major cuts twice since the recession. David Wheaton, the college’s vice president of administration and finance, said that while the changes were difficult for faculty and staff, the college in large part avoided controversy.

“A lot of people are talking about cuts or contracting right now, but my approach here has been to offer information to faculty about the budget every year. We find that making this routine, rather than making it dramatic, makes a difference,” he said. By the time the college experienced budget issues in 2009 and again in 2013, faculty members were already familiar with the financial landscape of the college, because in the early 2000s, Wheaton began presenting the college's budget each year in open
meetings to the faculty body, students and staff. So when the recession came around, the cutting process, though painful, was “pretty straightforward,” he said.

“There wasn’t nervousness or a lot of drama because they had seen it for six or seven years before that,” Wheaton said. “Talking about the budget is best not done for the first time when there’s a problem…. Discussions lacking context are almost always harder. If people don’t know what the larger picture is, then all they have to fill it in with is rumors.”

Juliette Rogers, a professor at Macalester who serves on the college's resources and planning committee, said that because of Wheaton's annual discussions about the budget, faculty weren't surprised when the school had to make cuts. She said her committee is in the midst of developing a financial literacy class for professors and students who want to understand more about how Macalester runs.

Faculty and staff compensation is the largest chunk of most universities' budgets -- and the industry has a tradition of generous compensation packages -- thus items like salaries, health care and retirement are often on the chopping block during times of financial strain. The cuts are deeply personal to faculty members, and they scrutinize change closely.

Discussions lacking context are almost always harder. If people don’t know what the larger picture is, then all they have to fill it in with is rumors. -- David Wheaton, vice president of administration and finance at Macalester College

“There are very few campuses that do not have scarce resources,” said Bob Shea, a senior fellow for finance and campus management at the National Association of College and University Budget Officers. “Resource allocation decisions are important and impact people, that's why you have to have so much communication up front.”

Cordery, the history professor at Monmouth, says administrator-to-faculty communication should happen “early and often,” and “before faculty reach a critical point of panic or terror or anger or frustration.” She added that one-on-one conversations are better received than mass emails, which are often seen as “some sort of proclamation from on high” by faculty members. Openness is also important. “Don’t try to deceive or decrease the magnitude of the problem.”

Of course, successful communication doesn't mean faculty won't object to the change. Often faculty members object to the substance of a plan. That's where shared governance and “genuine opportunities for faculty to share expertise” comes in, says Anita Levy, an associate secretary in the department of academic freedom, tenure and governance in the American Association of University Professors.

“They definitely do speak a different language” than faculty members, Levy said of administrators. “It's not simply a different language, it's viewing the university as a corporate model with a corporate bottom line.”

In a lot of cases, there's simply a divide on what administrators and faculty members consider solutions to a college's budget crisis.
“They talk about numbers. They have pretty clear ideas about where their institutions stand and where the challenges are, but at least in these small institutions, there’s a pretty acute awareness that, as clear as it may be to them, faculty see it differently,” Christopher Welna, president of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, said of administrators. “Some of them are more comfortable talking to faculty, and others are very nervous about it because... they’ve been burned by miscommunications in the past.”

The ACM runs an Institute on College Futures that educates faculty on the operational and budget sides of colleges, teaching them about common practices like tuition discounting. The goal is to spur conversation between, and build a common vocabulary for, professors and administrators on the campuses in the consortium's 14 colleges.

**Language of Change**

The 50-member faculty council at Creighton University, a Jesuit college in Omaha, Neb., last month unanimously passed a resolution of no confidence in the college's sweeping strategic plan. Thomas Coffey, secretary of the faculty council and a professor of modern languages at Creighton, believes that more than the substance of the plan, many faculty members are unhappy with the way the plan was communicated, shaped and delivered to university's stakeholders.

At first, Coffey says, the tagline behind the plan was “No Margin, No Mission,” a mantra some faculty members found difficult to get behind. “It puts it down to the money first, rather than, ‘Here’s the mission, now we have to go manage the resources well.’ It's too flippant.”

Coffey said faculty often feel that the “corporate vocabulary” administrators sometimes use is “at odds with the mission.”

"There are a lot of buzzwords you hear, and when I hear them I see people rolling their eyes,” he said.

Before entering academia, Wheaton came from a business background, spending the first part of his career as a banker and then transitioning into nonprofits with a job at the United Way. When he began working at universities, he learned over time not to use the same terms he used with fellow financial offers with faculty members. For example, he would not call students “customers” -- a practice most financial officers have moved away from -- when presenting the budget to the faculty.

There are a lot of buzzwords you hear, and when I hear them I see people rolling their eyes. --Tom Coffey, professor of modern languages at Creighton University

Kneedler, the former president of Franklin & Marshall, said that while administrators have a responsibility to “speak in a clear fashion” and not use “an arcane sort of administrative speak,” faculty members also must be willing to learn about the budget and recognize the financial constraints many universities are experiencing.

“IT’s important that faculty have a willingness to learn some terminology with which they might not be familiar, because the institution where they find themselves very likely needs to have skills in a variety of areas where they might not have been necessary 15 or 20 years ago, but they are absolutely vital today,” Kneedler said. “To
try to insulate oneself from the forces of change, to say, ‘Oh these are buzzwords,’
seems to me to be unproductive.”

Ann Davies, provost of Beloit College, a liberal arts college in Wisconsin, said
faculty members generally dislike vocabulary that hints at universities being a
“transactional” enterprise.

“Faculty do react very negatively to things that are perceived as buzzwords or business
jargon,” said Masten, the Michigan faculty member and an economics professor.

“You’ll hear administrators say universities are like businesses. There’s truth to that.
They have to balance budgets and have a lot of business-type functions,” he continued,
“but when administrators use that language, it’s a signal to faculty that they aren’t
appreciating what the differences are between academia and for-profit businesses.”
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Rebirth of the Research University

By Nicholas B. Dirks
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In California, some of us spend a good deal of time feeling nostalgia for days past (specifically,
1960) when the California Master Plan for Higher Education was codified, approved, and
financed. In the world of higher education, this visionary plan was the greatest organizational
idea for public higher education in the 20th century. It connected excellence in research to the
mission of near-universal education by defining the roles of its three systems of universities,
state colleges, and community colleges.

Today, however, there is a growing belief that higher-education systems modeled after the
master plan have run their course; many people in state governments and the public at large not
only assume that such a model costs too much in absolute terms, but also increasingly question
the value and quality of higher education, particularly of the sort delivered at elite research
universities. Indeed, at the root of debates about the cost of higher education, the worth of
college, the vocational utility of degrees, and the commitment to teaching among research
faculty, there is a widespread suspicion that we cannot have all that the master plan promised.
There is a growing belief, in particular, that research can no longer be the primary mission of our great universities.

Michael M. Crow, president of Arizona State University, is proposing a solution.

Clark Kerr, first chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley, then president of the university system, who is the architect of the master plan, saw it as the basis for the "second great transformation" of the American university. In Kerr’s structure, the university was "called upon to educate previously unimagined numbers of students; to respond to the expanding claims of national service; to merge its activities with industry as never before; to adapt to and rechannel new intellectual currents," he wrote. This was "a truly American university, an institution unique in world history, an institution not looking to other models but serving, itself, as a model for universities in other parts of the globe."

In subsequent years, however, Kerr sensed that the American research university had already begun to undergo a third transformation, far more difficult than the one before. Although he never worked out a new model, and concerned himself more with Berkeley’s survival as the flagship university than with the increasingly unsustainable provisions of the master plan, before his death in 2003 he began to write about the acute need to take on the increasing pressures of globalization, technological innovation, and demographic change.

Crow left Columbia University, where he had been executive vice provost, to become president of Arizona State the year before Kerr died (and two years before I joined the senior administration at Columbia). Now, a little more than a decade later, he asserts that his institution has become a model for how a great university can prosper and grow in the new century. His vision is described in a new book, Designing the New American University (Johns Hopkins University Press). He wrote it with a historian, William B. Dabars, who is his colleague in the office of the president.

When Crow moved to Arizona State, it was, he writes in the preface, "a burgeoning but then still largely undifferentiated regional public university." Not widely known for its research productivity, it was far from being a candidate for inclusion in the A-list of research institutions, the Association of American Universities. It was also not associated with innovative academic proposals of the kind discussed and illustrated in the book. The authors provide a meticulous review of the literature on the history of American higher education and an ambitious account of how Arizona has, in Crow’s words, "deliberately undertaken an exhaustive reconceptualization to emerge as one of the nation’s leading public metropolitan research universities." By that, he and Dabars mean an institution that combines accessibility to education for a diverse population, representative of the region and the nation, with an academic program grounded in the research and the production of new knowledge.

There is no doubt that Crow has had a transformational effect on the institution he leads. There is also no doubt of the power of his vision, one that deliberately echoes Kerr and the California master plan, updated to confront the challenges of the 21st century in the context of what Kerr himself had begun to see: major state disinvestment, steadily growing demand for student seats, and rapid economic, social, and technological change. Crow and Dabars aspire to a combination
of world-class teaching and research with broad accessibility in what they suggest is a hybrid plan, explicitly bringing together the two levels the California plan had kept distinct, the research-intensive campuses and the teaching-intensive campuses.

They see unexpected opportunities in their hybrid approach, arguing that the fact that ASU is not burdened by a history of excellence — in the manner of the "gold standard" they associate with Harvard University and my own Berkeley — is precisely what allows them to be so innovative. As they see it, they don't have to contend with the "filiopietism" of adherence to tradition. While that argument is reminiscent of Kerr's adage that he doubted whether the faculty of any great university would ever be able to "agree on more than the preservation of the status quo," Crow and Dabars mean more. The success of their new model depends on extensive institutional change, new ways to mix and leverage different disciplinary configurations and connections, organize new problem- and project-based collaborations, build new relationships between academic interests and the research needs and imperatives of the private sector, all to create what they call a "complex and adaptive knowledge enterprise."

The signal feature of Crow's tenure at Arizona has been a febrile pace of experimentation and innovation. Units have been reorganized to create research and collaboration opportunities for students and faculty, such as the School of Human Evolution and Social Change and the School of Earth and Space Exploration. A variety of new schemes to generate revenue have been explored, ranging from doubling down on technology transfer and philanthropy to newfangled ideas like the development of ASU Online, which doesn't just deliver traditional content via the web but also experiments with ways of fostering online student interactions. Expanding the latter program has entailed new sorts of partnerships with corporations, like Starbucks, to recruit their employees. And the campus has also energetically promoted the expansion of the traditionally enrolled student body, adding more than 20,000 students, with special efforts made to attract more low-income and underrepresented students. Arizona State University, in short, is taking its "mass education" mission as seriously as any university in the country today.

It's probably too early to evaluate the success of its model, though early signs are promising. Under Crow's leadership, the percentage of students with Pell Grants (i.e. students from low-income backgrounds) has steadily increased (much higher than at most flagship public universities, though still lower than the top institutions in the University of California system), but graduation rates have stayed frustratingly low. At the same time, while Crow correctly notes that admission to Berkeley (and the University of California at Los Angeles) has steadily become more difficult (now admitting less than 20 percent of applicants), ASU has adopted admissions policies similar to those of Berkeley in the 1950s and 60s, when high-school seniors needed only to graduate with a 3.0 grade-point average to qualify.

Research productivity has also increased: Crow and Dabars report that expenditures on research are up by more than 250 percent since 2002, without significant growth in the faculty. But Arizona State is not (yet?) a member of the Association of American Universities, and many of its more-innovative programs have not been in existence long enough to measure their real contributions or ultimate success. Certainly not all these innovations have always been warmly greeted. Crow's effort to channel resources into productive new arenas has also involved tough decisions to end programs, decisions that have been met with great resistance. Perhaps the best-
known case was the attempt to dismantle the Cancer Research Institute, which led to lengthy public controversy and litigation. It remains to be seen if genuinely advanced research can be productively pursued in a great many areas of endeavor, given the challenges of a student body and educational mission that resemble the Cal State system far more than they do UC.

Beyond the excitement generated by many of Crow’s proposals, what is perhaps most heartening is his commitment to the idea that research is a fundamental feature of the university, not one that can be dispensed with on the road to mass delivery of education. In this, Crow is arguing against the premise of most, if not all, for-profit education corporations, both online and off, which implicitly, if not explicitly, assume that educational "content" can be delivered to "customers" absent funding by corporate "suppliers" for the complex (and expensive) process of supporting research.

At a time when many critics question the role of research in education — except, perhaps, at private institutions with huge endowments, where alumni are satisfied that research does not compromise undergraduate education — it is refreshing to see evidence of genuine support not just for research but also for connecting innovation in research to innovation in teaching. Public research universities, in particular, are increasingly asked to justify their research efforts. There are greater doubts about the value of research in the social sciences, not to mention the arts and humanities, although even the sciences are experiencing a loss of confidence in the importance of much basic research.

Insofar as politicians do support research these days, they are talking about applied research, and that in areas where people can point to immediate benefit. Although educators offer example after example of how basic research produces applications that could never have been foreseen, and despite the growing need for advanced research in areas including political analysis (to, for example, document the relationship between money and political outcomes) and the extent to which the use of big data or new biomedical techniques can be analyzed in relation to human agency and the public good, that type of inquiry has been regularly denounced in Washington and widely disparaged in popular media.

The near absence of discussions of research in the spate of publications about college over the past decade is perhaps the most astonishing lacuna in the higher-education literature. The Great American University (PublicAffairs, 2010), an important book by Jonathan R. Cole, a former provost and dean of faculties at Columbia, contains an extraordinarily useful and wide-ranging set of illustrations of the value of research, but stands out almost as an exception. Fortunately, the AAU and the National Research Council have promoted the importance of research, and the association’s president, Hunter R. Rawlings III, was involved in the important 2012 report "Research Universities and the Future of America."

Those of us leading or working in research universities, especially public ones, face the urgent imperative to articulate and give full-throated explanations of the extent to which university research not only brings economic and social betterment (through new medicines, policies, products, jobs, etc.) but also is crucial to the educational mission. It drives discoveries that can be commercialized to enrich innovators and their backers, and it ensures that those innovations will be deployed to sustain the vitality of our economy, our society, and our human values. Research
is also a good in itself across the full set of disciplines and fields that constitute university life; it is an aptitude and skill that students, both undergraduate and graduate, learn in college that can be of lifelong value; and it is a force that generates new knowledge — and new modes of teaching and learning.

It is research that compels scholars and administrators to create institutes, centers, and programs that bring disciplines together. While we know that professional recognition and rewards for research often militate against interdisciplinarity in the short term, that kind of work is responsible for many of the most important breakthroughs in fundamental understandings, in methodology, theory, and even the data we use. We can cite examples in every field: the importance of information theory in the limits and possibilities of quantifying information for biology, of social psychology in behavioral economics, of historical or anthropological work in literary study. Research skills and experience are likely to be of as much importance as critical reading, writing, and numeracy for any sustained career in rapidly expanding knowledge industries.

The preoccupation with research may compete with time for teaching, or direct teaching toward narrow specialized fields, but research is also needed for many innovative reforms in pedagogy. And that is true well beyond the current enthusiasm for "maker" culture and its emphasis on do-it-yourself innovation and the integral role of design thinking in courses in many fields, from the arts to engineering.

Even the most traditional pedagogy is animated by a passion for new ideas, new interpretations, new contextual frameworks, and new evidence. Indeed, the bottom line is that teaching and research genuinely benefit from each other. The relationship is not simply the result of an accidental compromise in the history of American higher education, but a recognition of the importance of both activities for all our universities and colleges, even those that cannot support research at the highest levels. That is the basis for the pre-eminence of our global model; and that may be most at risk — both in funding and in popular attitudes — in the current crisis in university life.

At Berkeley we are developing a model different from Crow’s for reimagining the American university. As I announced last fall, we intend to build a "global campus" in nearby Richmond Bay. Instead of planting the Berkeley flag abroad, we want to create a new form of international hub, where an exclusive group of some of the world’s leading universities and high-tech companies will work side by side with us in a campus setting. We envision a collaboration not just among disciplines but across global institutions on topics like climate science, energy policy, data science, artificial intelligence, medicine, global health and inequality, urban studies, museum studies, and more. We have decided, however, that even in a context in which global research will be at its most innovative, we will have at the core of our institutional design an educational mission, beginning with graduate programs. Our first degrees will be in global studies, with a curriculum that will train a new cohort of world leaders to tackle today’s problems. We hope that teaching, research, practical engagement, and a public mission will combine to create an innovative next phase in the evolution of higher education as initially hypothesized by Clark Kerr.
Columbia’s new Mortimer B. Zuckerman Mind Brain Behavior Institute takes advantage of the excellence of the medical school and the rich resources of basic-science departments; Stanford’s pathbreaking efforts in the field of design are signs of the vitality of their deep connections with the technology sector, while enabling broad interdisciplinary collaboration across top colleges and departments; the Broad Institute in Cambridge, Mass., links and builds on the strengths in bioscience and medicine at Harvard and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Berkeley’s programs in the field of computing and data science (AmpLab, the Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing, the Berkeley Institute for Data Science) catalyze its unique expertise not just in computer science but also in social, statistical, and behavioral science, as well as, for that matter, in physics and cosmology. Those examples serve as reminders of the extent to which cutting-edge research can propel institutional change, even in places where traditions might seem most resistant.

As various universities compete with one another to establish their own new models for higher education, however, it is important to point out that most proposals are not designed to displace or endanger the highest-level research universities, whether private or public, which have successfully linked the undergraduate liberal arts with top-quality research and the production of knowledge. Crow and Dabars acknowledge that some leading universities are well positioned to advance knowledge in ways that will both transform some of our most basic understandings and radiate to other institutions (and not just through their Ph.D.’s who move on to teach and conduct research in these institutions).

And we must remember that the connection of excellence and access is not just a slogan but a necessity for all of us in higher education. That was the special genius of California’s master plan: attempting to forge and maintain connections at every level between teaching and research. The plan requires updating, with more emphasis on serving diverse populations of students, and continued expansion and innovation.

Crow and Dabars may not have reinvented the master plan, but they have made an important intervention in the debate about which models work best, for which purposes and constituencies, and how we can support those models at the scale they require, all while maintaining academic rigor and autonomy. As we carry the debate ahead, it is crucial that our commitment to research in the research university be unwavering, and that our advocacy for the many reasons that research matters be argued and advanced far beyond the university itself.

Nicholas B. Dirks is chancellor of the University of California at Berkeley.

Men Accused of Sexual Assault Face Long Odds When Suing Colleges for Gender Bias
NO MENTION

As federal officials have stepped up enforcement of rules requiring colleges to resolve reports of sexual assault, many accused students who contend that they were unfairly found responsible and expelled have sued their institutions.

But in the last month, victories for universities in two such lawsuits show how difficult it is for accused students to win legal battles against institutions on the issue. That is particularly the case if — as happened in the two recent suits — the students allege that in finding them responsible for sexual misconduct, their institutions discriminated against them because they are men.

The two cases that were recently rejected cited the very same gender-equity law that prohibits sexual assault — Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 — to claim gender discrimination on behalf of the male students found responsible. Andrew T. Miltenberg, the lawyer who represents the young men in both cases, says the judgments simply show that to be successful, accused students must broaden their approach, using additional claims against the universities that disciplined them for assault. He says he is appealing both decisions.

Last week Mr. Miltenberg also filed another Title IX complaint against Columbia University on behalf of a male student, Paul Nungesser, who was accused by a female student of sexual assault. The suit says that even though Columbia found Mr. Nungesser not responsible, it allowed his accuser — Emma Sulkowicz — to publicly call him a rapist and also gave her course credit for a performance-art project in which she has carried a mattress around the campus this year in protest of Columbia’s decision to exonerate Mr. Nungesser.

Legal experts say using Title IX to claim discrimination against male students found responsible can be tricky. "It is hard for somebody in that position to prove the reason that something went wrong in the university’s hearing of their case is because of sex discrimination," says Erin E. Buzuvis, a professor at the Western New England University School of Law who writes about gender discrimination. "So the question is, Is there another tactic?"

The two recent cases that were dismissed were brought against Vassar College and Columbia. In the Vassar case, Peter Yu contended that in finding him responsible for sex assault and expelling him in 2013, the institution had violated its own policies and Title IX. Mr. Yu has said he and the woman who accused him had consensual sex, but the university determined that the female student was too drunk to consent.

Judge Ronnie Abrams of the U.S. District Court in New York City granted summary judgment in favor of the university on March 31, saying that even if Vassar had made mistakes in handling his case, Mr. Yu did not prove that gender bias had caused the errors.
In the case against Columbia, Judge Jesse M. Furman of the same court this month granted the university’s motion to dismiss the Title IX claim brought by a male student identified only as John Doe, after the university suspended him in 2013 for having what it determined was a nonconsensual sexual encounter. The judge said that while the male student contended in his lawsuit that Columbia’s procedures were biased against men, the student had failed to offer specific examples of how he was personally discriminated against based on gender.

Judge Furman said that in order to succeed, a plaintiff must "allege particular circumstances suggesting that gender bias was a motivating factor behind" a university’s ruling.

Mr. Miltenberg says Judge Furman was looking for the kind of overt discrimination that no longer exists. "No one is sitting on a disciplinary panel saying, ‘I hate men. I think all college men are predators,’" says Mr. Miltenberg. "But that doesn’t mean that discrimination isn’t happening."

But Laura L. Dunn, founder and executive director of the advocacy group SurvJustice, says the court rulings should give universities confidence that their disciplinary proceedings in sexual-assault cases are fair. "This is showing," she says, "that universities have done the right thing."

Charged Atmosphere

In the past few years, colleges have faced increasing pressure from advocacy groups and the federal government to prevent sexual assault and improve the campus climate for women. Title IX compels them to resolve reports of sexual misconduct whether or not an alleged victim reports the incident to the police. If a college fails to handle cases promptly and fairly, the U.S. Department of Education can find that it has created a hostile learning environment and can strip the institution of all federal funds.

Young men who have been accused of sexual misconduct and disciplined by their institutions say the federal pressure has caused campuses to establish procedures for handling assault cases that are tipped in favor of complainants and that deny the accused due process. Some parents of those men have started a support group called Families Advocating for Campus Equality, and some young men are filing lawsuits against their institutions.

An organization called A Voice for Male Students lists 68 cases in an online database of lawsuits that allege violations of due process and other claims related to how universities handled assault claims. The list includes suits against Occidental College, Wesleyan University, the University of Massachusetts at Amherst, and another against Columbia University. Most of the suits have been filed in the last two years.

Charles B. Wayne, a lawyer in Washington, says only about a half-dozen claims by accused men alleging violation of Title IX have survived a motion to dismiss. And only one case, he says, has ever gone to trial, but not on the Title IX issue.
In a 2011 case against Sewanee: The University of the South, a federal jury found in favor of the accused male student, who was represented by Mr. Wayne. In that case, the male student alleged the institution had been negligent in handling the disciplinary proceedings against him by failing to follow its own procedures and by failing to use procedures that were standard among institutions for dealing with complaints of sexual assault.

Legal experts say that if accused students want to make successful claims against their institutions, they should file accusations in addition to violations of Title IX. For example, many lawsuits brought by accused students contend that their universities are guilty of breach of contract by failing to follow their own procedures for handling assault cases.

Some cases that allege violations of Title IX have settled short of a final verdict. In November, Swarthmore College agreed to vacate its decision to expel a student it found responsible for sexual assault. The student had filed a lawsuit in 2014, accusing Swarthmore of violating many of its own policies as well as with violating Title IX.

The University of Colorado at Boulder paid $15,000 to settle a lawsuit filed by a young man who contended the university had violated Title IX when it suspended him for nonconsensual sexual intercourse. The student said the sex was consensual.

Robin Wilson writes about campus culture, including sexual assault and sexual harassment. Contact her at robin.wilson@chronicle.com.