COLUMBIA —MU will confer degrees on 5,574 students during spring commencement ceremonies this weekend.

Between Friday and Sunday, MU will award a total of 6,185 degrees, with some students receiving more than one degree. The number includes 4,413 bachelor's degrees, 1,068 master's degrees, 334 doctoral degrees, 123 law degrees, 114 veterinary medicine degrees, 99 medicine degrees and 34 education specialist degrees.

At least 350 students will also graduate from the university's online program, Mizzou Online.

Susan Golden, an MU graduate and a prominent researcher in microbiology will receive an honorary degree during the Honors College ceremony at 8:30 a.m. Saturday in Mizzou Arena.

Golden's discovery of a biological cycle of cyanobacteria, which gets its energy through photosynthesis, reversed the previous notion that organisms with lifespans shorter than one day could not maintain an internal clock. According to a MU News Bureau release, the findings of this study could affect the development of biofuel or improve chemotherapeutic drugs.

Golden is a professor at the University of California, San Diego, and director of the Center for Circadian Biology. She graduated from MU with a doctorate in genetics in 1983.

Here is the schedule of the weekend events. Ceremonies in the Hearnes Center and Mizzou Arena will be live-streamed.
Friday

- **College of Human Environmental Sciences**: 1 p.m., Mizzou Arena. *Speaker*: Stephen R. Jorgensen, dean of the College of Human Environmental Sciences

- **College of Veterinary Medicine**: 1 p.m., Jesse Auditorium. *Speaker*: Jerry Jaax, associate vice president for research compliance and university veterinarian at Kansas State University

- **Trulaske College of Business**: 2 p.m., Hearnes Center. *Speaker*: J. Andrew Miller, partner with Ernst & Young LLP's national tax department

- **School of Health Professions**: 4:30 p.m., Mizzou Arena. *Speaker*: Munashe Chigerwe, associate professor of livestock medicine and surgery, School of Veterinary Medicine, University of California, Davis

- **Sinclair School of Nursing**: 5 p.m., Jesse Auditorium. *Speakers*: Joseph Riojas, Kirsten Wilford and Abbie Bredeman, graduating nursing students

- **Graduate School** (master’s and educational specialist candidates): 7:30 p.m., Hearnes Center

Saturday

- **Honors College**: 8:30 a.m., Mizzou Arena. *Speaker*: Susan Golden, honorary degree recipient

- **School of Medicine**: 12 p.m., Jesse Auditorium, Jesse Hall. *Speaker*: Mark Beard, assistant dean of medical student education at the Sanford School of Medicine, University of South Dakota

- **College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources**: 1 p.m., Hearnes Center. *Speaker*: Chris Koster, Missouri attorney general

- **Office of Graduate Studies** (hooding ceremony for doctoral candidates): 3:30 p.m., Jesse Auditorium, Jesse Hall

- **School of Journalism**: 4:30 p.m., Mizzou Arena. *Speaker*: Brian Smith, Pulitzer Prize-winning photographer

- **School of Natural Resources**: 6:30 p.m., Jesse Auditorium, Jesse Hall.

Sunday

- **ROTC commissioning of officers**: 9:30 a.m., Crowder Hall. Inclement weather location: Conservation Auditorium, Anheuser-Busch Natural Resources Building. *Speaker*: Col. Dave Boyle, U.S. Army
Mercy forms provider network with Mosaic Life Care, MU Health Care

Mercy has partnered with Mosaic Life Care and University of Missouri Health Care to form a multistate provider network, dubbed MPact Health.

Financial details of the three health systems’ partnership were not disclosed.

MPact Health will be governed by a nine-member board consisting of three representatives from each entity, officials said. Dirck Clark of Kansas City, formerly chief strategy officer for St. Joseph, Missouri-based Mosaic Life Care, has been named president of MPact Health.

“Together, we believe we will be even better positioned to meet the health needs of Missouri and the surrounding region,” Mike McCurry, executive vice president and chief operating officer of Chesterfield-based Mercy, said in a statement.

“MPact Health is designed to deliver value: low cost, high quality and high satisfaction,” Dr. Mark Laney, president and CEO of Mosaic Life Care and board chair of MPact Health, said in a statement.

The three organizations have been meeting together for several years to share best practices and will continue to do so, officials said Tuesday, with several initiatives underway including expanding telemedicine to underserved areas of Missouri and creating a database for research and evidence-based medicine to support population health management.

Combined, Mercy, Mosaic Life Care and Columbia, Missouri-based MU Health Care have more than 5,600 hospital beds, more than 47,000 employees and about 3,000 employed and affiliated physicians. The health systems serve patients in urban and rural areas of Missouri and surrounding states.
MPact Health will be structured so its members can work together as partners while allowing each health system to preserve its independence and identity, officials said.

Mercy is the nation’s fifth-largest Catholic health care system. Mercy Hospital St. Louis, the system’s flagship facility, posted $841 million in revenue for 2013.

MU Health to partner with other health care to provide efficiency

Watch story: http://www.komu.com/player/?video_id=28842&zone=5&categories=5

COLUMBIA - MU Health, Mosaic Life Care and Mercy announced Tuesday they will come together in a partnership to improve healthcare in Missouri and neighboring states.

The organization will be called MPact Health, and it would bring health care providers together to brainstorm best practices.

"Our goal is to build similar patient-centered cultures, leverage technology and use our combined clinical and administrative expertise to increase access and improve health care for patients in Missouri and beyond," said Harold Williamson Jr., MD, executive vice chancellor of the MU Health System.

A nine-member board will lead MPact Health. Dirck Clark of Mosaic Life Care and the Missouri Chamber of Commerce will serve as president.

Clark said MPact Health will create a database for patient information to allow for faster care of patients.
Mercy forms new 'multi-state provider network'

May 12, 2015  •  By Samantha Liss

Chesterfield-based Mercy Health is teaming up with two other Missouri-based health systems to create what it's describing as a multi-state provider network.

Mercy, University of Missouri Health Care and St. Joseph-based Mosaic Life Care now make up a new collaborative called MPact Health.

The goal is to deliver high quality care at a low cost, according to a joint statement released Tuesday. The three will work together to share best practices in areas such as business, clinical and operational.

The three are already working on certain initiatives to achieve its goal, those include: expanding telemedicine to underserved areas of Missouri, creating a database to support population health, working with payers to offer "innovative network options" that are also low-cost for patients.

The statement also indicates that the three will explore the "development of a clinically integrated network of employed, independent and private practice physicians focused on improving health care quality and outcomes."

MPact will be governed by a nine-member board, each organization will have three representatives on the board.

The president of MPact is Dirck Clark of Kansas City, board chair of the Missouri Chamber of Commerce. Previously, Clark served as the chief strategy officer of Mosaic Life Care.

Mosaic Life Care is based in St. Joseph where its 352-bed medical center resides. Mosaic serves northwest Missouri, northeast Kansas and southeast Nebraska. Mosaic is a member of the Mayo Clinic Care Network. It also operates an accountable care organization, or ACO.

FROM READERS: MU professor shares her struggle for tenure and her research on race

Juanita Simmons writes about the parallels between her research on race-based experiences in academia and her own academic journey.

Tuesday, May 12, 2015  |  4:36 p.m. CDT

BY JUANITA SIMMONS/MISSOURIAN READER
Juanita Simmons is an associate professor in the MU College of Education. Her expertise is in equity issues in public school leadership, national achievement gap and school renewal.

One lesson that I learned early in life was that failure can have many advantages. What you do with failure determines future success. When I was asked to share my tenure and promotion experiences at MU, I thought about my failed attempts at tenure, the many appeals, and my eventual success in achieving it.

I also reflected over the many positive changes that have taken place in my department since that time. The strategic, intentional efforts to recruit, promote, and retain underrepresented faculty and students have been remarkable. In fact, our division is believed to be one of the most racially and ethnically diverse faculties on campus.

I am grateful to have participated and to witness that major transformation. With my college division’s efforts, our social justice focus, and the initiatives of certain university organizations toward honest and intentional inclusion, I trust that others will not have to repeat my tenure experiences.

I must first explain that my tenure experiences interconnect with my position as an African American, middle-aged woman, mother/grandmother, wife, former inner city school teacher and administrator, and former community activist in a large urban city of a southern state. It is appropriate for me to state my position as a researcher and human being because much of what I present here is centered or connected with who I am and why I am.

I was a mid-career public school administrator when I accepted this tenure-track position at MU. In addition to researching, teaching, and giving service, my assignments included helping to facilitate the university’s urban school partnership. The partnership required commuting to the urban center in order to teach the district’s aspiring leaders. During the same time, I taught a pre-service teacher course on campus and attempted to maintain research productivity and service.

The assignment was actually ideal for me considering my knowledge and direct experience with urban education issues. Even though the reduction in salary and the relocation from family and friends were a challenge, I perceived that an opportunity to
help aspiring teachers and administrators gain knowledge about teaching and leading diverse populations to be worth the sacrifice.

I also welcomed the opportunity to study, write, and research the various pitfalls and hopeful possibilities of PK-12 teaching and leadership, particularly my concept of emancipatory leadership — an ongoing study about social justice leaders who intentionally design their leadership platforms for the liberation and emancipation of self and others (Simmons, 2014). Editors’ note: References are at the end of this post.

As a school administrator, I had interviewed young White females who desired teaching positions in public schools. I was surprised to find that few, if any of them, had any experience or knowledge about diverse populations. Even though White females comprise three-fourths of the nation’s teaching core, so many of them originate from mono-cultural backgrounds, and most states require little or no diversity training for their certifications (Akiba, M., Cockrell, K., Simmons, J. M., Han, S., & Agarwal, G., 2010).

Yet, the nation’s largest population in public school students are high-poverty, minority, and school-dependent children. In that the position offered me an opportunity to have one class of pre-service teachers, I embraced the opportunity to help aspiring teachers. I thought that my experiences and critical instructional platform would aid them in being better prepared for future success with poor and/or minority children.

I understood the importance of transforming school climate to include such practices as socializing intelligence by helping teachers to broaden their expectations of children. I also had success increasing advanced academic opportunities, combatting disproportionate special education placement and disciplinary referrals, and infusing culturally diverse materials into state-mandated curricula.

I had fought and successfully replaced low-level classes with more advanced academic replacements, reviewed-identified-prescribed remediation to combat disproportionalities in special education placement and disciplinary referrals, written and infused culturally-relevant literature and courses to align with state-mandated curricula standards, designed and implemented rites of passage programs for mentoring and socializing minority teens, and implemented programs to increase and inform student knowledge for civic service and engagement.
I was proud to witness the subsequent academic success of poor and/or minority students.

Most important, I understood the power and influence that teachers and administrators had in helping students to become informed leaders with intentional platforms to flourish the lives of others. I felt confident that I would be successful, and I was excited to begin this new career as a tenure-track professor.

On the other side of my successful urban school experience, I understood how policies, infrastructure and design, traditions and habitual actions of educational institutions created challenges and barriers for school administrators who attempt to establish such programs and endeavors mentioned here. That experience expanded my task in rethinking leadership administration in a manner to better prepare leaders. But I was soon to understand how those same factors (policies, institutional practices, etc.) found in public schools can also become barriers to tenure and promotion in the academy, especially for African-American females in predominantly White institutions.

It was not until I began preparing for tenure that I came to understand that the priorities were different from my naïve dreams. I was confronted with the fact that my focus really should have been on three major areas: socialization into the academy, collegiality, publications and grants.

I also discovered that the actual tenure process began the day I accepted the position. Socialization into the academy? With my assignments, I neither knew nor had the time to become saturated into the main elements of successful tenure and promotion. Rather than my being mentored by accomplished professors, I was commuting to urban school centers to teach aspiring leaders. I was loving it — it was my dream come true! But, ultimately, I was to be measured against others who had the privilege on focusing on their research, many of whom had been socialized by way of post-doctoral appointments or previous assignments at smaller universities. Collegiality? With whom?

I was the only African American in my department. And although I never sensed any direct isolation from colleagues, I thought that my work with the partnership and my classes were valued by my colleagues. Besides, the MU Black Studies Division (now a department) reached out to me and provided the needed social network. Unfortunate for me, there were no professors of color there who shared my same discipline of study nor department/division knowledge.
It is said that tenure success is directly aligned with one’s success in collegial relationships, including research support and opportunities, and general socialization into the academy. Well, I had never even seen a dossier. Anyway, my energy and time were focused on what I believed to have been critical circumstances of our profession.

When it was time to submit my dossier to my colleagues, issues surrounding one of my first semester end of course (student) evaluations suddenly became a calamity. Remember that class with pre-service teachers who had little or no experience with diverse populations? Now, I understand why so many of them escape diversity training in their pre-service programs. Nobody wants to risk the students’ resistance to content (especially anti-racist content), nor does anyone welcome the potential damage that student resistance to race and gender content hold on their teacher evaluation ratings from students.

The derogatory evaluation was only one of the many episodes that resulted in my having to appeal my department’s decision to deny me tenure. Next came the issues with my scholarship productivity. Mind you, I’d spent my formative years working with the wonderful partnership. Although I still have no regrets for that experience, I blame myself for my own ignorance to the actual expectations of tenure. During that time, research worthiness was measured by counts, placements of articles, and grants.

Although my research did not really require grants, I had applied for a few small grants to support a couple of rural school districts’ professional development. The university partnership program was expensed by a major grant and the university’s support. My research agenda, leadership development for women and minorities in public education, led to publications in the few journals which, at that time, trail blazed publications about oppressive content. Besides, having not been socialized into the academy, I was not familiar with journal ratings and publication tiers. I only knew that I needed to fulfill a count, and I believed that I had been successful in accomplishing that.

Mentoring was greatly needed and appreciated. I knew that the one person appointed to me for mentoring was swamped with administrative duties and teaching. She was a great asset, but her time was very limited. Although supporters were limited, I had the comfort and advice from one colleague who, along with a cadre of African-American tenured faculty, fought with me from my department/division, to the college’s denial, and on through the university appeals procedures. Volumes could be said about their
support. I witnessed the power of a semi-critical mass (Black tenured faculty) and will always be grateful for the one colleague from my division who stood with me.

In addition to collegiality and socialization, having a critical mass is essential while preparing and bidding tenure, especially when appeals are necessary. The Black Studies department at MU has served as a haven for many professors of color and others whose research surrounds oppressive content (race/gender/SES, etc.). However, the small number of professors of color at MU are not quite a critical mass. This was especially so five years ago when I was bidding tenure.

Although our numbers have increased, retention is still a challenge. Some departments still have NO faculty of color. As an example of the representation of African American faculty in comparison to other ethnicities, see the chart in MU's 2014 Fall Employee Census Report.

MU reported 2,034 full-time ranked faculty in the fall of 2014. The total includes all ranks: tenured, on tenure track (OTT), and non-regular (Non-Reg.). Of a total 2,034 faculty, 61 faculty listed themselves as Black/African American — 3.00%; 65 faculty listed themselves as Hispanic/Latino — 3.20%; 258 faculty listed themselves as Asian — 12.68%; 4 faculty listed themselves as American Indian/Alaska Native — 0.2%; 1,532 faculty listed themselves as Caucasian/White — 77.73%.

Although statistically insignificant, beginning in fall 2010 the faculty questionnaire consisted of two new racial demographic categories: two or more races, and native Hawaiian/Pacific islander. With that, comparative data from years prior to 2010 may show minor changes due to change in data collection.

The percentages for American minorities (domestic minorities) suggest that recruitment, promotion, and retention of domestic minorities remains a challenge at MU. Although numerous efforts and gains of several departments, colleges, and university organizations have been made, this challenge still remains.

Admittedly, several organizations and departments have implemented initiatives to promote cultural competence across the campus. There has truly been a major thrust for diversity in university-wide initiatives such as the Chancellor’s Committee on Diversity and the College of Education Dean’s Diversity Committee, to name a few. Efforts of certain departments and divisions have resulted in 50% (or better) increase in
minority faculty representation (i.e. the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis division of COE).

However, more conversations and safe platforms are needed to dialogue about how to effectively recruit, promote, and retain more American domestic minority faculty (African American, Hispanic/Latino, and American Indian). This conversation is overdue and is greatly in need of amplification. Recommendations and solutions are easily found but difficult to implement without intentional strategies from the various colleges and their divisions/departments.

Examples of such recommendations for the recruitment, promotion, and retention of African-American faculty were gathered during a 2007-2008 study on fourteen African-American tenure track, women professors at a predominantly White Midwestern university.

Recommendations from the extensive interview responses about their tenure experiences included the following:

1. level the playing field for tenure and promotion;

2. provide explicit orientation and mentorships;

3. value research agendas on oppressive issues;

4. project workloads;

5. increase minority faculty hires, including senior minority senior faculty;

6. collect and report demographic data to track hiring;

7. revisit promotion and tenure policies (especial focus on service loads, definitions of quality scholarship, tenure-track stoppages, hearings, etc.);

8. increase the morale of retention of underrepresented faculty;

9. conduct exit interviews;
10. collect and report demographic data to track promotion and tenure stats, including division/department disaggregated data;


Important also to this study was that the women expressed a need for networking and social opportunities for minority faculty. Some of the women left after their tenure experiences. In fact, one participant commented that the tenure experience was so trying for one Black woman that she left before her tenure award was ever announced.

This was unfortunate because in addition to being alone in their private lives, many of these women were sole minorities in their departments and felt alienated by their colleagues; therefore, they felt that they had limited opportunities for racial socialization to help them buffer the many challenges. Sadly, twelve of the fourteen women in this study claimed that their experiences with racial encounters were more challenging than meeting the requirements to earn tenure. Interestingly, the study found that almost all of the women were eventually successful in earning tenure, but few of them remained to tell the story.

References:


Free food fills Missouri Capitol's hallways as ethics bill dies

May 13, 2015  •  By Virginia Young

JEFFERSON CITY • Hungry legislators, staffers, lobbyists and onlookers converged outside Sen. Kiki Curls’ office at noon Tuesday to help themselves to platefuls of ribs, chicken and sausage served up by the famed Gates Bar-B-Q.

Lobbyists paid for the feed, which drew a line that wrapped around the Senate side of the Capitol. Curls, whose Kansas City district includes Gates' headquarters, hosted the event, as her Senate predecessors did each spring before her.

The meal is among the most popular ones during the 4½-month Missouri legislative session, but it is far from unusual.

For lawmakers, a typical day in the Capitol might start with bagels in the Rotunda, include a picnic or fish fry on the lawn at noon, continue with a cupcake from a state university at midday and conclude with a buffet reception at a local hotel, hosted by credit unions or soybean farmers or any of a number of other groups with a stake in legislation.

Missouri imposes no limits on lobbyist-provided meals or gifts. And that appears unlikely to change when the legislative session ends at 6 p.m. Friday.

An ethics bill has languished in a House-Senate conference committee since early April. The sticking point: whether to impose a $25 cap on individual meals, tickets and trips that legislators receive from lobbyists.

House Speaker John Diehl, R-Town and Country, favors the cap, saying it would “get rid of the excesses,” such as expensive dinners, entertainment and trips. The House added the gift cap to the Senate-passed ethics bill.

The bill’s sponsor, Senate Majority Leader Ron Richard, R-Joplin, opposes the cap, saying it could be easily circumvented: A lobbyist who represents multiple companies, for example, could simply divide the cost of an expensive outing among his or her clients, assigning $25 to each one.

“All it is, is a way to hide stuff,” Richard said.

Richard prefers to increase transparency by requiring lobbyists to name the individual recipients of committee meals, rather than just listing House or Senate committees.

With only three days left until adjournment, the conference committee appointed to iron out the differences has never met, though negotiators have traded drafts. They say they have resolved all issues in the bill except one: the gift cap.

MOST STATES HAVE CAPS

If no ethics bill passes, Missouri will be bucking the trend, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures.
Only 10 states have no limits on gifts to legislators. In the last five years, almost half the states have passed some type of gift law. Last year alone, the NCSL said, changes passed in at least five states: Arkansas, California, Kentucky, Virginia and Washington.

The laws vary widely, ranging from “zero tolerance” in 10 states to monetary limits in 30 states. Iowa sits at the low end with a $3-per-day lid while Texas is among the highest, allowing $500 for gifts and $500 for entertainment annually, according to NCSL.

The push for gift laws “has gathered steam because legislators want to make certain that the public understands that these gifts do not influence public policy,” said Peggy Kerns, who recently retired as the director of NCSL’s Center for Ethics in Government.

In Missouri, special interests paid $277,849 to wine and dine legislators during the first three months of this year, according to Ethics Commission records.

That’s less than in 2014 and 2013, when expenditures in the first quarter hit $436,490 and $470,143, respectively. The food tab apparently dropped this year because Diehl barred House committees from having off-site dinner meetings and eating lobbyist-provided food while conducting hearings.

Sen. Scott Sifton, D-south St. Louis County, wants to ban lobbyist-provided gifts altogether.

Sifton let the Post-Dispatch collect all the invitations he received this year. Since January, the senator has been asked to attend at least 135 free meals, ballgames and other entertainment events.

The offers came from pilots, dentists, firefighters, pawnbrokers, motorcyclists, water districts, private colleges, community colleges, biotechnology companies, pharmacists, labor unions, interior designers, insurance agents, accountants, veterans, sheltered workshops, podiatrists, retired teachers, trial attorneys, marriage and family therapists and the Missouri Press Association, among others.

He turned them all down.

“Taxpayers are already reimbursing us for meals,” Sifton said, referring to the $103.20 daily expense allowance that legislators receive to cover lodging and meals in the Capitol. “I think it’s wrong for legislators to pocket that money rather than use it for its intended purpose.”

Gifts he rejected included a tin of cinnamon rolls, luxury suites at Blues games, “one of the hottest craft beers” (Bur Oak), which was offered at an Ameren Missouri reception, and barbecue from Pappy’s Smokehouse, courtesy of the St. Louis Regional Chamber.

There was a Senate crab boil thrown by lobbyist Ginger Steinmetz, a “cooking with beer” demonstration by Missouri Beer Wholesalers, wine-tastings in senators’ offices and a corned beef and cabbage lunch hosted by Express Scripts on St. Patrick’s Day.

Whether a sandwich buys a vote isn’t the question, said Sen. Rob Schaaf, R-St. Joseph.

“You will at least feel some goodwill toward the guy after he pays your way,” said Schaaf, who advocates a wide-ranging ethics proposal. “The rule is, ‘You dance with the one who brung you.’”

**PARTIES AND MEMENTOS**

Affluent trade groups may throw the fanciest galas but increasingly, everyone has something edible to offer — from small businesses to Probation and Parole officers to the Missouri State Alliance of YMCAs.

Getting their message out in the era of term limits is the goal, the groups say.
Heating and air conditioning companies sponsored a breakfast on March 11. Years ago, they banded together as the Missouri Coalition for Fair Competition to fend off utilities that aimed to get into the heating and air conditioning business.

“We have our members come down and educate new members of the General Assembly who may not know what our coalition is,” said Richard McIntosh, the group’s lobbyist. “We just buy bagels and donuts and juice.” The tab: $543.

Everyone wants to be remembered, a truism that special interests know well.

After the Missouri Energy Development Association’s reception on Jan. 14, legislators left with a portable cellphone charger emblazoned with the trade group’s initials.

Electric carmaker Tesla Motors, meanwhile, offered test drives during its Jan. 26 reception. The company, which sells its cars directly to consumers, has been battling with the state’s auto dealers.

Longtime lobbyist John Bardgett brought an army of nurse anesthetists to the capital to hold a “cocktail reception” on Feb. 24. The nurse anesthetists opposed bills that would have limited their practices. (The legislation appears dead.) The party’s tab: $2,883.

**That same night, senators could opt to watch the University of Missouri-Florida basketball game from the president’s suite at Mizzou Arena in Columbia. Mizzou popped for $400 in basketball tickets at $40 apiece.**

It’s impossible to tell who went; no individual names are listed on the MU lobbyist’s report because the entire Senate and two House committees were invited. That’s one of the problems Sen. Richard hoped to fix when he filed the ethics bill.

Freebies also can be hard to track if a legislator uses campaign funds to reimburse a lobbyist for tickets or meals. That way, the gift doesn’t appear on the lobbyist’s report. However, special interests provide campaign funds, too, so it’s not as if the legislator dipped into his or her own pocket to pay the tab.

Critics say the debate over gift caps is irrelevant. They say it’s those five-, six- and even seven-figure campaign contributions that legislators should be worried about. Missouri has no campaign contribution limits.

“That is more important, going out to a $100 dinner or taking $10,000 in campaign contributions?” asked Rep. Brandon Ellington, D-Kansas City, during House debate.

Sen. Paul LeVota, D-Independence, agrees that campaign contributions are the bigger issue. Still, LeVota says capping gifts would be “a half-step forward” in improving public confidence in the Legislature.

“We have a huge problem with ethics,” LeVota said. “The people of Missouri wonder why we’re allowed to have unlimited lobbyists’ gifts, why we’re allowed to have unlimited campaign contributions.”

*The bill is SB11.*
'You need to give me your phone' -- Camera restrictions in legislative hearings spur debate

May 13, 2015

By Kevin McDermott

Even as a Missouri Senate committee on Monday debated controversial “right-to-work” legislation that pits business groups against labor unions, another debate was rumbling around the edges of the room in the state Capitol. Call it “right to tweet.”

The committee chairman, Sen. Mike Parson, R-Bolivar, announced there would be no pictures, video or audio recording allowed from journalists or the audience. Instead, he said, an official video of the hearing would be made available afterward.

When radio journalists on hand protested, Parson partly relented and said he would allow audio recording, but nothing else. “There will be no video ... no still pictures while we’re here,” he said.

In the audience, Grace Haun quietly disregarded the order, aiming her phone, shooting pictures, and tweeting them out.

“Wonder if I’ll get kicked out for taking a picture,” she wrote in one tweet.

A Senate doorman “gave me a couple warnings,” said Haun, who works for the liberal advocacy group Progress Missouri — and who acknowledged in an interview Tuesday that she was purposefully testing Parson’s edict.

Eventually, “the doorman tapped me on the shoulder and said, ‘You need to give me your phone,’” said Haun.

“So he took my phone.” She said when he later offered it back to her outside the committee room, she told him that she intended to go back in and take more pictures with it. “So he said I wasn’t allowed back in the room.”

The confrontation may sound minor. But it’s part of a wider debate already on its way to court before Monday’s controversy, with Parson himself as a co-defendant: Are Missouri lawmakers illegally limiting the public’s view of what they do, under the guise of maintaining decorum?

Progress Missouri filed suit last month claiming that Parson and fellow senators Mike Kehoe and David Sater have routinely violated the Missouri Sunshine Law by arbitrarily barring audience members from taking pictures and videos during hearings, and that a Senate rule is “overly broad” in giving them the power to do it.

The Sunshine Law says recording must generally be allowed in public meetings. But it lets governmental bodies establish “guidelines” to “minimize disruption.” That’s what Parson has implicitly cited in shutting down the lenses and microphones at hearings.

Whether that argument holds up in court may come down to whether he and others can show that allowing open recording of hearings by anyone is inherently “disruptive.”
Some say that could be a tough sell in a cellphone era where small, silent video cameras fit in every pocket, purse and palm.

“It used to be that cameras were these huge behemoths that were quite intrusive,” said Sandy Davidson, a professor at the University of Missouri School of Journalism who specializes in communications law. Today, she noted, “it would be hard to know if somebody with a camera is even recording.”

“There is a presumption of openness in this state,” she added. “As long as the equipment being used is not disrupting, I see no cause to try and curtail it.”

The suit, filed in Cole County, claims that the committee chairmen have allowed more freedom to record by working journalists than by other audience members, even though the Sunshine Law doesn’t draw any distinction between reporters and the general public in terms of access of information.

Jean Maneke, attorney for the Missouri Press Association, said the allegation that lawmakers have been arbitrary in shutting down recording — changing the rules from meeting to meeting, granting recording rights to some and not others — might be especially difficult to explain in court.

“The language is pretty clear” that disruption is the only reason officials can shut down recording, she said. “Just arbitrarily taking away people’s cellphones seems to me to be outside what the law says.”

Parson, who recently announced he is running for governor, didn’t return a message seeking comment Tuesday.

Attorney General Chris Koster’s office has said it intends to “vigorously defend the Legislature in this matter.”

*Alex Stuckey of the Post-Dispatch contributed to this report.*

**An Outside-In Leader**

May 13, 2015 by Susan Henking

**NO MU MENTION**

Is it possible to be a college president and speak one’s mind? Can I believe in critical pedagogy that leads people to question authority and change the world? Am I allowed to think about higher education beyond its business model? Must I be a proponent of neoliberalism? Could I speak truth to power still, or do I only serve
power as president?

These questions ran through my mind as I thought about walking outside into the streets on the night of the initial grand jury decision not to indict anyone regarding Michael Brown’s death.

They are the questions that are always there, in one form or another, when I encounter donors, alumni, students and others who find my lifestyle as out lesbian or intellectual ruminations and commitments repugnant.

These form a nagging undercurrent when I think through the tense relation of budgetary management and educational mission. While biblically based thinkers are concerned about whether Christians can serve both God and Mammon (with only occasional clarity across history, that the former trumps -- or ought to trump -- the latter), as a secular president of a great books liberal arts college, my questions are as existentially difficult. Can we, as leaders, serve multiple masters? Must we?

On the one hand, business and financial plans, market pressures, and related matters call for our attention and even devotion. One’s mission fails if one’s books do not balance. On the other hand, educational ideals are what brought many of us to the positions we hold. One’s mission fails if dollars are all that matters.

On the face of it, colleges, indeed all of higher education, favor critical thinking and responsible citizenship. We argue not only for individual lives transformed but a world made more just and equitable. While access and affordability, diversity and open discourse, can be buzzwords, they also speak to our commitment to ensuring that all are fully part of what we used to call the American Dream. Does the tension between our multiple masters (sometimes called constituents or even stakeholders) require us to abandon our bully pulpit or trivialize our commitments into sound bites? I hope not.

In a recent discussion with my partner (who is a faculty member) and a president from a dramatically more well-known institution, I argued that higher education leadership programs for senior administrators train managers rather than leaders who wrestle with the ethical dilemmas that face us. I wondered aloud about the place of formation and discernment in the making of president and chancellors.

Not one of the many leadership development programs I have participated in looked seriously at sexual assault and rape on campus (other than as areas requiring risk management and media control), for example. Nor did we explore much in the way of how to stand one’s ground in the face of proffered money from organizations that support war or pursue other businesses that might trouble us in our “private” lives.

We looked at budgets, but less directly at what values budgets might express. We learned an enormous amount about management. And yet, we looked only indirectly at the consequences of being symbols of the institutions we would lead or
the quandaries and grayness of the worlds in which we navigate. All too often we turned away from examination of the risk of demagoguery or slippery slopes that come with power.

Some time ago, in a different context, I heard women leaders describe their aspirations to be inside leaders with outside values. Those who used the phrase -- and I have come to adopt it -- meant that they aspired to hold positions of leadership (jobs, careers and titles) while retaining the values and social change orientation more associated with civil rights or social change work than with budgetary management.

Both are critically important. Losing leadership because managerial matters are so important, though, is dangerous. Why?

While, as presidents, we symbolize the institutions we lead, and we navigate all of this, we also teach: what it means to be a leader, to be a person who leads and to remain both person and symbol. Struggling is part of that lesson that we hide too often, as we hide our commitments if we run from the magic that called us to these positions at the outset -- the magic of real change and real, educated hope.

Challenging the Rationale for Job Cuts

May 13, 2015 by Colleen Flaherty

NO MENTION

Two more institutions could be headed for censure by the American Association of University Professors at its annual meeting next month, based on the content of twin reports out today on the University of Southern Maine and Felician College. The reports, based on AAUP investigations of alleged violations of academic freedom and tenure on both campuses, question campus rationales for faculty job cuts and possibly shed new light on conditions for professors on the ground. The institutions, meanwhile, argue that AAUP is not a regulatory body and largely reject the claims made in the respective reports.
University of Southern Maine

“In terminating the appointments of 60 of the 250 full-time faculty members and eliminating, reducing or consolidating numerous academic programs, allegedly on financial grounds, the administration of [Southern Maine] acted in flagrant violation” of AAUP’s principles on academic freedom and tenure and its recommendation that true financial exigency be present and demonstrated before faculty members are terminated, reads AAUP’s report on that institution.

Southern Maine also acted in “brazen disregard” of AAUP’s statement on and its own procedures for shared governance in eliminating multiple academic programs without consulting the faculty, the report says. “The program closures at [Southern Maine] are not merely matters of bookkeeping; they impinge on matters of curriculum and instruction, for which the faculty should always have primary responsibility. The administration’s ignoring the faculty senate, repeatedly and apparently deliberately, is at odds with generally accepted norms of academic governance in American higher education.”

AAUP’s tone isn’t surprising, given its involvement for more than a year in opposing planned cuts to academic departments and faculty lines at Southern Maine. In April 2014, roughly two dozen layoffs were called off amid public outcry, but in the fall the university under a new president unveiled plans for deeper cuts: between one-fifth and one-sixth of the faculty (about 50 professors) and about 100 staff members, along with a swath of programs. The national AAUP at the time argued that Southern Maine’s claims it had to balance the budget in the face of a $16 million projected shortfall, based on current enrollments, were unsound -- or at least didn't amount to the existential financial threat that could by AAUP standards excuse the terminations of tenured faculty members. Faculty members had a week's time to submit comments on the cuts before the Board of Trustees of the University of Maine System voted to eliminate the graduate program in American and New England studies and the geosciences department, along with the arts and humanities major at the Lewiston-Auburn College campus.

The next month, in October, the university announced even more sweeping program cuts and consolidations to “fundamentally transform” its campus. Plans included the merger of English, philosophy and history into one department, and the same for chemistry, physics and math, to the tune of 50 eliminated faculty positions (eventually 61, about half of which were terminated under the retrenchment provision in the National Education Association-affiliated collective bargaining unit’s contract and the rest through retirements). Southern Maine said it wanted to become a “metro university,” distinct from all other campuses within the state system.

The new report offers evidence supporting AAUP’s suspicion that Southern Maine was more flush than it let on to the faculty, which repeatedly asked for proof of financial exigency. The AAUP report suggests that programs may have been cherry-picked for closure to accommodate its emerging “metro campus” model and as not to compete with other Maine system campuses’ missions over any real financial need. In the case of the department of applied medical sciences, for example, the
university’s accounting considered only graduate tuition dollars -- not grants, which more than cover the $455,623 gap between faculty salaries and tuition revenue. AAUP says that during the course of its investigation, the administration said grants to the program had been declining, but that it didn't uncover any evidence of such a trend. The report also includes lengthy testimony from local biotech executives, expressing bewilderment that the university would shutter a program promising collaboration with and employee training for local industry.

“The investigating committee has cited these letters at length because the investigating committee has never seen anything like them,” the report says of the testimony. The committee, “baffled by this response, finds it impossible to imagine how [Southern Maine] is not serving as a ‘metropolitan university’ by maintaining a program in the life sciences that directly serves the needs of biotechnology firms in the metropolitan area.”

Citing faculty testimony and a speech by President David T. Flanagan in November to corporate partners of the university -- in which he said having “two flagship universities wasn’t such a great idea” -- the committee suggests that the changes at Southern Maine have been part of a systemwide mission realignment more than anything else. (Interestingly, the system recently announced it is seeking accreditation to become a collection of campuses under a single university, as opposed to seven different universities within a system.)

AAUP says that Southern Maine faculty members involved in the investigation recounted similar irregularities in assessing program viability, such as counting majors rather than enrollment in some instances and not others. That’s despite a Faculty Senate recommendation that programs be assessed by the same formula. The report also alleges numerous instances of administrative attempts to “stymie” faculty participation in the process, such as moving a scheduled board meeting to the other side of the state, some 300 miles away.

Program closures involved no “teach-out” strategies, leaving researchers and students alike “stranded,” the report says.

In a response to an early draft of the AAUP report, Southern Maine alleged factual inaccuracies and problems with the AAUP investigative process, such as the inability of the university to meet with and cross-examine witnesses. It also called the suggestion that it was operating on a surplus “erroneous” at best. The university stressed its belief that AAUP has no authority over it.

In a statement released late Tuesday, the university reiterated its concerns, calling the AAUP report “unworthy of serious consideration.”

“The AAUP is sadly out of touch with the current needs and realities of public universities, and its ill-founded financial analysis is a misleading attempt to paper over the urgency of the economic situation of our state higher education system,” reads the statement. “[Southern Maine] is proud to serve as an affordable, accessible and high-quality public institution located in the economic and cultural
center of Maine. We celebrate our students and faculty and work to build a prosperous future for our students and our communities.”

Michael Bérubé, Edwin Erle Sparks Professor of Literature at Pennsylvania State University, led the AAUP investigative committee. He said the circumstances surrounding the closure of the applied medical sciences program were “key” to understanding what’s happening across campus. The idea, it seems, he said, “is to knock [Southern Maine] down a peg so that it doesn't rival [the Orono campus] as the flagship -- President Flanagan actually said that in so many words.”

Beyond the whys of the closures, the hows were just as bad -- seemingly “above and beyond the usual travesties,” Bérubé said via email. “Look at the fact that the programs were closed midyear (!) without teach-out provisions for the students in the programs: [Southern Maine] acted as if its financial situation was so dire that if it did not ax these programs and faculty immediately, the mob would cut off their fingers on Jan. 1.”

Bérubé said he didn’t speculate about AAUP censure, but that that he thinks the report “makes a very strong case that severe violations of AAUP principles occurred at [Southern Maine] and [Southern Maine] administration has been very emphatic in saying that they do not believe AAUP principles apply to their institution.” Lorrayne Carroll, associate professor of English at Southern Maine and president of the new AAUP advocacy chapter on campus, said the report -- while damning and an accurate reflection of what’s been happening on campus -- left the “door open” to possible remedies before AAUP initiates any censure vote procedures ahead of its annual conference next month.

“What this report sums up is what’s been going on for years leading up to what has become a real crisis here,” Carroll said. “But I think the most important point is that the university is a place when everyone collaborates... When people come into a position of leadership and just ignore or actually violate those process on which the entire edifice is built -- shared governance and faculty consultation -- then you wind up with not only a crisis but an institution that’s not able to carry out what the people of Maine want us to carry out.”

**Felician College**
AAUP’s other report out today documents alleged violations of academic freedom and abuses of the tenure system -- or the lack thereof -- at Felician College, a private Roman Catholic institution in New Jersey.

“In terminating the appointments of 16 full-time faculty members, 7 of whom sought the association’s assistance, the administration of [Felician] attributed its action simply to the ‘exigency of the college’s financial status,’” which didn’t exist, reads the AAUP report. “The only discernible reason for the administration’s terminating the appointments of approximately 15 percent of the faculty (and presumably assigning some of their courses to part-time faculty members) was its dubious desire to [increase] the ratio between full-time faculty and students
In so doing, the report continues, Felician shed more than a dozen faculty members who had served well over the seven-year period that AAUP says should afford even untenured faculty members the due process afforded to tenured peers. In making the terminations final and not subject to review, Felician “acted summarily and in virtually total disregard” of AAUP standards, which are widely followed by colleges and universities.

AAUP also alleges that Felician retaliated against one professor for speaking out against the cuts last year to Inside Higher Ed, denying him emeritus status despite many years of well-reviewed service. That and the overall climate at Felician greatly inhibited faculty members’ willingness to participate in AAUP’s investigation, the report says, asserting that academic freedom on campus "barely exists."

In January 2014, Felician sent an email to affected faculty members saying it was “facing the necessity to focus on its financial stability to ensure its future.” Due to declining enrollments, it could not maintain the number of faculty members “accrued” in the last several years, and, consequently, would not be renewing some contracts.

The college said it knew the professors would continue to serve their students “in a most professional way for the remainder of the semester.”

At the time, several high-performing, long-serving faculty members in interviews with Inside Higher Ed said they were blindsided by the cuts and never given a reason why. The university had previously undergone a “re prioritization process” to assess program viability, but the cuts were seemingly unconnected to that effort. According to the AAUP report, one of those professors, Robert Ingoglia, was later retaliated against for his public remarks. Despite serving for 19 years -- 9 more than what was required for emeritus status -- Ingoglia was denied by the president the honorific that would have signaled to potential future employers that his dismissal was not performance related and would have allowed him continued access to the college library. Ingoglia -- who taught history and a host of other disciplines, and who directed the college’s computer labs -- was never given a reason for the denial but AAUP suggests it was his remarks to Inside Higher Ed. AAUP calls the move “astonishingly petty and punitive.”

AAUP also determined, through interviews and communications with various administrators, that the cuts had less to do with the reprioritization process than a desire to eliminate full-time faculty members to better compete financially with peer institutions. In an August letter to AAUP staff, Anne M. Prisco, Felician’s president, reportedly wrote that a study of 20 institutions revealed that the college had an unusually low student-to-full-time-faculty ratio. So with a temporary drop in enrollments, AAUP concluded, Felician was looking for an excuse to shed full-time faculty. According to one now-retired dean’s account, the faculty elimination process was completed without any faculty input, and with no clear set of criteria.
(A senior administrator allegedly said at one faculty town hall meeting that those who had been pegged for termination were those who would “land on their feet.”) At no point was the college in dire financial straits due to lower enrollments, AAUP says.

No faculty members filed grievances with the college, a fact AAUP attributes to the finality with which the financial exigency excuse was presented, and a culture of fear -- in this case a fear of sudden termination (the faculty members were given five months’ warning). The report also alleges a long-term lack of shared governance at the college, in which faculty members were left “in the dark” about major institutional decisions.

The AAUP report alleges an unwillingness on the part of college to participate in the investigation, up to and including the “blacklisting” of all AAUP email addresses on the Felician server, beginning in December.

Felician released a statement Tuesday disputing AAUP’s take on its personnel actions, calling them “necessary.” The statement also notes that “AAUP has no formal affiliation with faculty on the Felician College campus and no jurisdiction for investigating our practices.”

It continues: “Our commitment to placing students first requires us to make prudent decisions regarding the allocation of their tuition dollars to ensure a quality educational experience. The procedures we used to reduce faculty positions were fair and undertaken thoughtfully with the faculty impacted by this reduction in force.”

Felician said it agreed to reinstate faculty members “as our fiscal situation improved,” and that five of seven faculty members offered back their positions returned.

Greg Scholtz, director of academic freedom, tenure and governance at AAUP, said the Felician investigation was notable for its “petty retribution” toward Ingoglia and the unprecedented blacklisting of AAUP email addresses “to prevent the AAUP from communicating with it and with members of the faculty.”

There’s also the contrast between the college’s stated Franciscan values and the way it allegedly treated faculty members, Scholtz said, and the continuing mystery surrounding the layoffs -- along with the remaining faculty members’ fear of participating in the investigation.

All that considered, Scholtz said -- barring any positive developments in the coming weeks -- “it is difficult for me to see a basis for [AAUP] not recommending censure.”

Diane Zannoni, the G. Fox and Company Professor of Economics at Trinity University in Connecticut, and chair of the AAUP committee investigating Felician, said she didn't know if the report would lead to a censure recommendation. But
what the case clearly points out, she said, "is how quickly a faculty can be silenced where there is not tenure. How quickly an academic environment can change from one where there is an exchange of ideas to one of silence and fear when there is no due process."