Estate gift to help with cattle research at MU

By Alan Burdziak

Saturday, March 12, 2016 at 12:00 am

Barry and Marge Slayton’s time at the University of Missouri taught them to be willing to adapt to whatever happens in their careers, and the couple wanted to give back to the institution that helped them succeed.

On Friday, the Slaytons and officials said the couple had given $2.65 million from their estate to support beef genomics and nutrition research at MU. The Slaytons’ gift will go toward research into improving the nutrition of cattle and reproduction practices used on beef farms as well as help fund undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships, said Thomas Payne, vice chancellor and dean of the College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources.

“The work they’re doing helps us better identify genetics that we can use to mark animals or identify animals and breed them better and produce better and stronger versions and increase the value in the state,” Payne said of researchers during an event to publicize the gift at Jesse Hall.

The Slaytons’ contribution will enhance an MU animal sciences program that is ranked among the best in the world, Payne said. Barry Slayton has an interest in beef genetics and his wife is interested in nutrition.

“Genetics is on the cutting edge now,” Barry Slayton said. “That really intrigues me from that standpoint and we just thought that would be a good way to combine our gift, cover both areas of focus and do the most good.”

Marge and Barry Slayton met at MU and both hold degrees from the university. They live on a 1,000-acre farm with about 100 head of cattle in West Plains.

The donation is the second announcement in as many days about the university securing funding for research in the College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources. Gov. Jay Nixon appeared with Payne and other officials Thursday at the Bradford Research Center as they revealed the college won a $4.2 million grant from the National Science Foundation to study how drought affects corn and other plants.

On Thursday the Missouri House approved a bill that would cut $8.6 million from the UM System budget; $1 million of that total would come from the MU budget. Some legislators have
been critical of the university’s response to unrest in November that led to the resignation of then-System President Tim Wolfe, using the events to justify efforts to reduce the university’s state funding.

Payne said the donation comes at an important time for MU and the state of Missouri.

MU receives $2.65 million for beef research, better human nutrition

PAYTON LIMING, Mar 11, 2016

COLUMBIA — Barry and Marge Slayton pledged an estate gift of $2.65 million to MU on Friday.

The gift will be used to research beef genomics and nutrition through the College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources. The Slaytons decided to pledge to MU because they both earned degrees there — Barry Slayton in science and Marge Slayton in home economics and extension education.

Barry Slayton credited his success in life to his ability to adapt in his career. "We have been blessed throughout our lives as a result of our education and hard work, both of which can be attributed to the time we spent at the university," he said in an MU news release.

The Slaytons now run a farm in West Plains, Missouri, where they raise about 100 red angus and red simmental cows on roughly 1,100 acres. Marge Slayton has long been interested in nutrition, while her husband has been interested in animal genetics. The research they will fund will focus on improving cattle genetics and, in turn, boosting human nutrition.
As part of the project, the best cattle sires and dams will be selected and bred. This improved generation will then increase profitability and economic stability while being socially conscious, said state beef extension specialist Jared Decker after a Friday ceremony at Jesse Hall announcing the gift.

Researchers will see improved fertility, more feed-efficient cattle, animals more adaptable to climate and an enhanced quality of meat, he said. Decker described the process as being personalized medicine for humans.

Thomas Payne, vice chancellor and dean for CAFNR, said the gift will enhance the beef production in Missouri as well as neonatal health for humans.

"Our beef genomics and nutrition faculty are international leaders in their fields, and I know that with this support from the Slaytons, our faculty will be able to make amazing discoveries and advancements," Payne said in the release.

The gift is counted toward the "Mizzou: Our Time to Lead" campaign, which has raised more than $700 million so far.

"We have always tried to be conservationists," Marge Slayton said after the ceremony. "Barry farms and rotates fescue and summer grasses for our cattle. We have our timber fenced off and love the animals that live there."

In the past, she said, they raised quail, which were later released onto their timber land that doubles as a licensed hunting reserve. Then their dogs — Miz and Zou — flushed the birds for her husband to shoot.
MU receives $2.65 million to fund research in beef production


COLUMBIA – The University of Missouri received a $2.65 million donation Friday to support research into beef genomics and nutrition.

Genomics is the study of genes and their functions.

MU alumni Barry and Marge Slayton donated the money to advance the nutritional health of cattle and the reproduction practices of farmers.

Barry Slayton said this donation will help create healthier beef for the population.

"The fact that we gave the money to research...it can impact the most people in a greater area if something is discovered. It's important," Slayton said.

Slayton said Missouri is usually either second or third in the country for beef cattle production, so the donation will help move the beef industry forward.

"If we can increase the quality of our nutrition, which beef is a good quality protein, that will help the general population in Missouri," Slayton said. "From an agricultural stand point, that also increases the ability to sell beef which helps the farming community, which will over all help the agricultural economy."

Dean of MU College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources Tom Payne said this donation will also help create more food production in Missouri.

"These advancements will result in real-world answers for improving beef production, which will mean real-world economic developments and more food production for hungry populations in our state, nation and world," said Payne.
Slayton said his donation is not a result of recent budget cuts to the University.

The Slaytons began planning the $2.65 million donation two decades ago. The couple have also raised cattle for more than 40 years.

MU gets $4.2 million to study drought stress on corn roots
Posted March 10, 2016 by Tom Steever

The University of Missouri is getting $4.2 million from the National Science Foundation to study corn root growth during drought.

“This is great news for Mizzou and a testament to the outstanding work being done here at the division of plant sciences,” said Missouri Governor Jay Nixon at the outset of a roundtable discussion held at the University of Missouri’s Bradford Research Center.

 “[MU plant science professor] Dr. [Robert] Sharp’s research into how corn crops respond to drought has enormous implications, and could lead to the development of new hybrids and more resistance to drought conditions in Missouri, across the nation and around the globe,” said Governor Nixon.

The research could lead to genetic corn varieties that are more resistant to drought, said Dr. Thomas Payne, dean of the MU College of Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources.

“Root biology’s very, very complex and I think a lot of people don’t even think about roots, but everything that grows is very, very dependent upon the root system and what goes on in those roots,” Dr. Payne told Brownfield Ag News. “It’s a very important part of plant physiology.”

Governor Nixon held a roundtable discussion with MU researchers and administrators to announce the grant.

Listen to the story: http://brownfieldagnews.com/2016/03/10/mu-gets-4-2-million-to-study-drought-stress-on-corn-roots/
Governor announces $4.2 million grant to MU for crop research

By Alan Burdziak

Friday, March 11, 2016 at 2:00 pm

Amid controversy surrounding the University of Missouri and the General Assembly’s barrage of budget cuts to the UM System, Gov. Jay Nixon visited Columbia on Thursday as he and other officials touted a $4.2 million grant the MU Interdisciplinary Plant Group received to fund crop research.

Shortly after a tour and roundtable discussion with students and the leaders of the project at the Bradford Research Center, 4968 S. Rangeline Road, Nixon fielded questions from reporters. He said he hopes the Senate will restore a $56 million increase in higher education funding included in his 2017 budget draft that House lawmakers cut by $8.6 million.

“I’m disappointed that they’re not joining us in working together to keep tuition down, move this state forward and improve the opportunity for higher education,” Nixon said. “That’s so important.”

During the 2016 legislative session, which began in January, lawmakers have sought to punish the UM System’s flagship campus for unrest that spurred the November resignations of UM System President Tim Wolfe and MU Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin.

Student group Concerned Student 1950 brought international attention to MU through demonstrations over racism on campus that sought Wolfe’s ouster. At the same time, faculty members and deans called for Loftin’s dismissal and said he created a “toxic environment through threat, fear and intimidation.”

Some legislators and other politicians have been critical of the university’s response to the November protests.

The Missouri House on Thursday approved a higher education spending bill that would cut $8.6 million in funding to the UM System, taking $1 million from MU and $7.6 million from system administration. The bill has been sent to the Senate.
Nixon said he thinks interim UM System President Mike Middleton and his staff have done a good job. Asked whether the unrest and its aftermath have hurt MU’s image, Nixon said Middleton and officials are “doing a lot of things to address those challenges.” He deflected a question about whether he is concerned about a projected decrease of 1,500 students at the Columbia campus.

“Students from around the world are choosing” MU, Nixon said. “Faculty members from around the world are choosing the Show-Me State for their careers. … We shouldn’t have a bad week in November slow down the significant progress that this institution and higher education in the Show-Me State are making.”

The governor appeared alongside Middleton and several other university officials at the research center to announce the $4.2 million grant from the National Science Foundation. Changes in climate and precipitation in the world over the past few decades have made it difficult to grow enough food to feed the Earth’s population, Nixon said. Students and faculty who specialize in plant sciences, biochemistry, biological sciences, computer science and journalism will collaborate on the research project, which will study how the roots of some plants respond to drought conditions.

“The goal is really to understand, get a much more detailed comprehensive understanding of how root growth adapts to drought,” said Robert Sharp, a professor of agronomy at MU and director of the interdisciplinary plant group.

Drought has the largest effect on crop yields worldwide, he said, and the four-year project will examine the roots of plants such as wheat, corn and sorghum in simulated drought conditions.

“The work we do should be fundamentally important to helping crop performance in drought both in Missouri and globally,” Sharp said.

**University of Missouri enrollment and budget picture 'grim' for fall, faculty leader says**

By Rudi Keller

Friday, March 11, 2016 at 2:00 pm
A 23 percent decline in prospective student deposits for the fall semester is the most important figure forcing a 5 percent budget cut to general fund spending at the University of Missouri, the campus’ enrollment manager told the MU Faculty Council on Thursday.

Interim Vice Provost Barbara Rupp said 3,733 prospective freshmen had paid a $300 deposit for the fall as of Monday, down from 4,862 students at this time last year. It is usually possible, she said, to project fall enrollment based on the number of deposits received by this point.

“That kind of forecasting is impossible this year,” Rupp said. “It is just so completely different because our deposits have been down for so long.”

The cuts that include a hiring freeze, no pay raises for the fall and a 5 percent reduction in general fund spending were announced Monday by interim Chancellor Hank Foley. Those steps are expected to cover $20 million to $22 million of a $32 million shortfall in tuition revenue; the remainder will come from reserve funds.

The cuts do not include steps that might be taken if lawmakers also reduce state support. The budget approved Thursday in the Missouri House reduces funding for the Columbia campus by $1 million and support for the system administration by $7.6 million.

The university enrolled 6,191 freshmen in the fall, and the campus plans for at least 900 fewer first-time students for the fall. Total campus enrollment is expected to drop by as much as 1,500. There were 35,424 students enrolled at MU this past fall.

“The situation for next year is grim,” said council Chairman Ben Trachtenberg.

The council executive committee met with members of the provost’s staff Monday to discuss the upcoming fiscal year, Trachtenberg said. The depressing details were similar to those announced a few hours later in a campus email from Foley, he said.

“The budget is what it is,” he said. “If the money’s not there, it’s not there. We are all going to do our part to try to make it work.”

The enrollment drop and state budget cuts result from an almost unbroken stream of controversies on campus that have garnered national and international attention. The most visible were the campus demonstrations by Concerned Student 1950 and the boycott of athletic activities by the Missouri football team that led to UM System President Tim Wolfe’s resignation.

Other factors contributing to the decline, Rupp said, include shrinking high school graduating classes, more aggressive recruiting by states such as Alabama and more students being accepted at the University of Illinois, a major regional competitor.

The university will have a better idea of what to expect this fall by May 1, Rupp said. That’s the cutoff date for seeking deposit refunds. Deposits must be paid before incoming students can participate in the summer welcome programs or be assigned on-campus housing, she said.
“We are doing everything we can to increase the yield,” she said.

Many of the schools, colleges and departments at MU are helping by contacting prospective students to encourage enrollment, Rupp said.

While she called the efforts “nothing short of remarkable,” the overall effect is uncertain.

“We don’t know how much change we can effect,” she said.

**MU to test emergency alert system Tuesday**

Sunday, March 13, 2016 at 12:00 am

The University of Missouri plans to test its Mass Alert and Warning System on Tuesday.

The drill, scheduled for 1:30 p.m., coincides with the sounding of the city and county’s outdoor warning sirens, according to an MU news release. The test is in cooperation with the Boone County Office of Emergency Management.

It includes text messages to students, faculty and staff members who have opted in to the text alert system, a mass email alert, desktop notification to computer screens that have MU’s alert software system installed, social media posts to MU’s Facebook and Twitter accounts and a notice on the MU Alert website. ALERTUS beacons located in lecture halls, common areas and hallways of most MU classroom buildings and student unions should sound an alert for 30 seconds and flash silently for three minutes.

If the weather prevents the drill, it will be rescheduled for April 6.

**Missouri governor calls for restoring money for university**

By ADAM ATON
Jefferson City, Mo. (AP) — Missouri Gov. Jay Nixon called on lawmakers Friday to restore proposed budget cuts for the University of Missouri and boost education funding above the spending plan that passed the House this week.

The House voted Thursday to pass a budget that cuts more than $8 million from the University of Missouri System and its Columbia campus, with many Republicans and some Democrats saying administrators haven't addressed concerns over how it handled student protests in the fall.

The governor said the university administration has shown it is tackling its problems, and cutting the university's funding would wind up hurting students.

"Making students pay more tuition is not the way to send a message to anybody," Nixon said.

House Speaker Todd Richardson has said there is no reason students should be affected by the cuts. More than $7.6 million of the cuts are directed toward the system's administration, while another $1 million would come from the Columbia campus.

Nixon said the University of Missouri's administration has gone to great lengths to address concerns raised after November's unrest, when students protested what they saw as administrators' indifference to racism on campus. The protests culminated in the resignation of the system president and chancellor of the Columbia campus. The university has instituted new diversity training and appointed an interim vice chancellor for inclusion, diversity and equality.

"The new president, new administration are doing incredible things to try to make sure we're dealing with issues as far as discrimination," he said. "They're responding and working."
Nixon, a Democrat, has frequently been at odds with the Republican-led Legislature. He vetoed 18 bills last year, and the Legislature overrode 11 of those vetoes.

Nixon's budget called for a 6 percent increase to performance funding to universities, which he said would prevent tuition from rising next year. Lawmakers granted a 2 percent increase — but not to the University of Missouri.

The system is budgeted to receive $428 million of state funding this fiscal year, which ends June 30. State funding comprises about 15 percent of its budget. University officials are anticipating a drop in enrollment will lead to a budget shortfall of tens of millions of dollars.

The House budgeted about $70 million to increase core funding to K-12 schools — roughly $15 million less than the governor proposed, and about $440 million less than what it would take to fully fund public schools under the state's foundation formula, the legal guidelines on how much money schools should get from the state.

"I'm deeply troubled at a trend that has already developed: a repeated failure to prioritize public education, and a cynical attempt to hide it," Nixon said.

The governor cited a Senate bill passed last week that would change the school funding guidelines to require less money and the House's plan to fund some education programs through a surplus fund that would have money only if revenues exceed the expectations of lawmakers. He said that money might not become available until it is too late in the fiscal year to spend it.

Nixon blamed the state's tight finances on a tax cut — instituted over his veto in 2014 — that is due to kick in next year. He also pointed to more than 40 bills in the Legislature that would cut taxes further, none of which have been passed yet.
Public education not a priority for lawmakers, Nixon says

JEFFERSON CITY • Gov. Jay Nixon, a Democrat, denounced the Republican-led Legislature on Friday for not making public education a priority.

"I'm deeply troubled by this trend that's developed ... a repeated failure to prioritize education and the cynical effort to hide it," Nixon told reporters Friday.

His harsh comments come just a day after the Missouri House signed off on a $27.1 billion budget for the 2017 year that begins July 1. That budget falls short of Nixon’s recommendations both for higher education institutions based on performance funding and the Foundation Formula, which funds K-12 public schools.

In part, this is due to the House basing its budget on a lower revenue growth estimate -- 3.1 percent -- than Nixon's projection -- 4.1 percent. To make up for the difference, House Budget Leader Tom Flanigan, R-Carthage, plans to implement a surplus revenue fund, where money will be funneled if the state exceeds the House's projection. Dan Haug, Nixon’s budget director, estimates the state will not reach the governor’s estimate until about three days before the budget year ends.

Nixon recommended in January a $55.6 million increase for public higher education institutions based on performance funding, which would allow universities to freeze tuition. The budget approved Thursday by the House would give those institutions, excluding the University of Missouri System, a piece of about $9.4 million in performance funding in the surplus revenue fund. That means universities won't receive that money unless the state exceeds the House's estimate.
The budget "zeros out performance funding and students will be left picking up the tab for higher tuition and fees," Nixon said. "It's bad for students (and) terrible for the economy."

The governor also recommended an $85 million increase for the Foundation Formula, which would leave the formula about $424 million underfunded. The House’s budget funnels an about $71 million increase to the formula.

The formula, which should have been fully funded in 2012, has been woefully underfunded for years. To combat this problem, lawmakers are moving forward with a proposal that would make it easier to fund the formula by capping spending growth. That change would reduce the amount needed to fund the formula to about $140 million from more than $500 million.

When the formula first was created in 2005, it contained a 5 percent cap meant to limit the growth of the state adequacy target — the minimum amount the state is supposed to assure is available per student in state and local funding. That cap was removed by lawmakers in 2009, in part because they were expecting a significant increase in new gaming revenues that did not pan out.

A few years later, the implications of this change became clear as the target began to grow virtually unchecked. That growth made it all the more difficult to fully fund the formula.

Nixon condemned the plan Friday, calling it "step backwards" that he could not support.

He also vilified the House’s $30 million proposal to restart a cost sharing program meant to offset some of the transportation department's funding woes. The program would allow the department to split the cost of transportation system projects with local communities. The department suspended its cost-share program in 2014 as its construction budget continued to decline.
That program is housing in the surplus revenue fund, meaning the department only could access those funds if the state reaches Nixon's revenue estimate.

Legislative leaders have noted this program would not fix all the monetary problems facing the department, but they say it could help. Republican House Speaker Todd Richardson previously has said he'd rather find money within the budget for the department than increasing the state’s 17-cent-per-gallon gas tax for the first time in 20 years. Nixon supports a gas tax increase.

The state has "always funded transportation through dedicated transportation and user fees, not general revenue," Nixon said, adding that relying on general revenue for transportation leaves "less money for public schools and other needed services.

The 13 budget bills have been sent to the Senate for further debate. Nixon implored the Senate to restore the education cuts before lawmakers must complete the budget May 6.

"Underfunding schools, increasing college tuition, weakening the Foundation Formula and taking money from school kids and using it to fund potholes -- that’s not what you do if public education is a top priority," Nixon said.

MISSOURIAN

Nixon condemns legislative effort to cut UM System budget

ELLEN CAGLE, Mar 11, 2016

JEFFERSON CITY — MU has taken strides to mend its image, and the legislature is wrong to cut its funding as a form of punishment, Missouri Gov. Jay Nixon said at a press conference Friday.
"To say ... that the university is doing nothing is just not true. It's just not," he said. "The university and the administration and everybody is reacting and working hard, and all (legislators) are doing is perpetuating the problem and making it worse by not supporting the students."

Nixon voiced harsh criticism for the education budget bills the House approved Thursday, which include a $7.6 million cut for UM System administration and an additional $1 million cut from MU's budget, which will be redirected to Lincoln University.

"With the legislative session not even halfway over, I'm deeply troubled at a trend that is already developing — a repeated failure to prioritize public education and a cynical effort to hide it," he said.

Nixon's proposed budget includes a $56 million increase in performance-based funding for Missouri universities, which was zeroed in the version passed by the House, Nixon said. The budget also included a $70 million funding increase for K-12 schools, which is $440 million less than what's needed to fully fund them, according to the Associated Press.

Every university in the state will bear the burden for decreased higher education funding, Nixon said.

"All that's going to happen is that tuition is going to skyrocket," he said. "If you're a student at Missouri Southern or SEMO, and you're going to have a tuition increase, and the only excuse the legislature has is that something happened last November that the legislature didn't like at Mizzou — that's an excuse for not doing your job."

Nixon said it's irresponsible for the legislature to cut MU's budget and transfer the money to Lincoln University.

"Taking money away from schools and repurposing it like that in a very small amount and trying to sell that as generosity ... is a long way from where we should be in the budget process," he said.
The House reached gridlock this week while debating how to fund the UM System. Many representatives said university leadership has failed to fix problems stemming from racial protests that led to the resignation of former UM System President Tim Wolfe last November. Others, including several Boone County legislators, said it's retaliatory to cut MU's funds.

On Tuesday, Rep. Caleb Rowden, R-Columbia, proposed an amendment to redirect about $4.3 million from the Department of Revenue and the Department of Transportation to MU to ease the proposed cuts, but his motion was voted down.

MU will suffer from decreased enrollment, so it's unnecessary for the legislature to further slash its budget, Rowden said.

In a memo emailed Wednesday, MU Interim Chancellor Hank Foley said MU enrollment is expected to drop by 1,500 students next fall, which would amount to a $32 million budget gap. As a result, MU will enact a hiring freeze and a 5 percent cut to its fiscal year 2017 general revenue budget, he said in the memo.

In the press conference, Nixon praised efforts by Interim UM System President Mike Middleton and Foley to promote diversity and fix problems at MU. He cited required diversity training and the hiring of new diversity officers as positive improvements.

"Everybody is well-aware of what happened up there, everybody has looked at it very carefully, there have been significant changes that have been made," he said. "The core function of our university is very strong, and it's going to continue to be strong."

House vote sends bill with University of Missouri cuts to state Senate
JEFFERSON CITY — **The Missouri House approved a higher education spending bill Thursday that cuts $8.6 million from the University of Missouri as punishment for the outcome of campus protests against racism and missteps on several other high-profile issues.**

The 108-46 vote came after about an hour of debate that saw lawmakers question the costs of the Columbia campus student center, faculty teaching waivers and the participation of the Missouri football team in Concerned Student 1950 protests.

“We cannot reward bad behavior,” said House Speaker Pro Tem Denny Hoskins, R-Warrensburg. “We cannot reward lack of leadership.”

Defenders of the university found their arguments were futile. State Rep. Caleb Rowden, R-Columbia, tried to reverse the cuts on Tuesday but did not speak about the bill Thursday, he said, because he hopes the money might be restored in the Senate.

“The fight’s not over,” Rowden said. “I don’t want to burn bridges unless I have to.”

The announcement Wednesday that the Columbia campus faces a hiring freeze and department budget cuts of 5 percent because of a projected loss of $32 million in tuition revenue had no effect on lawmakers, Rowden said. He spent “dozens of hours” on the phone over the weekend trying to enlist support for the university, he said.

“I am not sure we are dealing with 163 people with open minds,” he said. “It was an uninformed, foolish and ignorant vote.”

Rowden and Reps. Stephen Webber, D-Columbia, Kip Kendrick, D-Columbia, and Chuck Basye, R-Rocheport, voted against the bill. Rep. Caleb Jones, R-Columbia, was the only Boone County lawmaker to vote for it.

Jones has been highly critical of the university’s delay in firing Assistant Professor Melissa Click and of the administrative turmoil that stemmed from fall protests, which led UM System President Tim Wolfe to resign and contributed to the resignation of MU Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin.

“The cuts to the University of Missouri definitely do affect our land-grant system, but the University of Missouri should count their lucky stars that they weren’t zeroed out,” Jones said.

Black lawmakers were critical of the university for long-standing racial problems on campus, with some supporting the cuts and others opposed. Rep. Karla May, D-St. Louis, was critical of the cuts and accused her fellow lawmakers of penalizing the university for listening to the Concerned Student 1950 demonstrators.
“We are punishing them because they didn’t stop the rise,” May said.

Under the appropriation bill, the university would receive $426 million in state support in the year that begins July 1. The bill divides the university’s appropriation into seven line items, one for each campus as well as lines for the system administration, Extension and multicampus programs. The cuts take $1 million from the Columbia campus allocation and $7.6 million from the system administration.

During the debate, supporters of the cuts cited numerous causes for their displeasure with the university. State Rep. Rick Brattin, R-Harrisonville, pointed to the MU Student Center, recently ranked the best in the nation by Best Student Reviews website.

“MU has invested money in a resort for students, for their jungle gym,” he said. “We have rock walls, we have lazy rivers. It’s absurd.”

The center was built with fees paid by students and enacted after a student election. Rowden said confusion about how facilities are funded contributed to his inability to reverse the cut.

“You have people who get up and talk about things, these outlandish expenses that are paid for with student fees — the same person who filed a piece of legislation to take scholarships away from athletes we obviously have no power over,” Rowden said, referring to a bill to punish athletes that Brattin proposed and promptly withdrew in December.

Rep. J. Eggleston, R-Maysville, said he was upset with the university for allowing almost half of tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach less than a standard load and because it gave privileges to a doctor who performed abortions at Columbia’s Planned Parenthood clinic.

“They are there to instill the occupational skills and knowledge to enable our children to get a job,” Eggleston said. “That’s it.”

Kendrick argued on the House floor that the cuts would not hit their intended target. He also questioned whether anyone cared about the long-term effects.

“At a time when we feel like damage has been done to the university, when damage has been done to an integral part of the economic engine of the state, our response is to do damage,” Kendrick said. “I think we have spent more time over the last four months talking about Melissa Click than the issues that are important to our state.”

Webber was standing at a microphone to speak when the House voted to end debate. He said he’s frustrated because the House is outraged over events at the university but silent about scandals that toppled House Speaker John Diehl last year and forced Rep. Don Gosen, R-Chesterfield, to resign.

“We don’t have the same speaker we started with because of a scandal, we don’t have all the people we started in January with because of a scandal, and nobody is proposing to cut the House
budget,” Webber said. “They want to hold tens of thousands of students and employees to a standard they are unwilling to hold themselves to.”

What you need to know about the House's vote on the budget

Rep. Caleb Jones was the only lawmaker from Boone County to vote for the cuts.

By Allyson Vasilopulos and Katherine Knott

This past Thursday, 108 members in the Missouri House of Representatives voted to cut funding for the UM System by $8.6 million.

Lawmakers have used budget cuts as a way to voice their concerns over the events from the fall semester, including the university’s handling of assistant communication professor Melissa Click, who was fired Feb. 25. State appropriations made up 15 percent of the UM System’s budget this past year.

The cuts were announced near the end of February by House Budget Committee Chairman Rep. Tom Flanigan, R-Carthage.

“For several months legislators have had stories relayed to us from current and past students, staff, and faculty of a vast bureaucracy that rivals the Pentagon in terms of red tape and delays,” he said in a news release.

House Bill 2003, the higher education appropriations bill, broke up the UM System’s state appropriations into seven line items and cut $1 million from MU. Last year, MU received $220 million from the state.

On Friday, Gov. Jay Nixon spoke out against the cuts in a press conference. In his initial budget, Nixon proposed a 6 percent funding increase for higher education. Members of the House Budget committee opted for a 2 percent increase but withheld that boost from the UM System.

"To say ... that the university is doing nothing is just not true. It's just not," he told the Columbia Missourian. "The university and the administration and everybody is reacting and working hard, and all (legislators) are doing is perpetuating the problem and making it worse by not supporting the students."

Four area lawmakers voted against the bill. Rep. Caleb Jones, R-Columbia, was the lone holdout.
“The cuts to the University of Missouri definitely do affect our land grant system, but the University of Missouri should count their lucky stars that they weren’t zeroed out,” Jones told the Columbia Tribune on Thursday.

Jones currently lives in Columbia, and received both his master’s and law degree from MU. He did not return The Maneater’s calls as of Thursday night. He represents three other counties in addition to Boone.

Rep. Caleb Rowden, R-Columbia; Rep. Chuck Bayse, R-Rocheport; and Jones signed a letter on Feb. 26 calling for the restoration of the cuts.

“The free market is holding the University accountable for its mistakes,” the letter read. “Now we must give administrators the opportunity to respond and adapt.”

Anger toward MU

In the discussion on the House floor, representatives fought over the terms of the bill, some calling for immediate removal of UM System funds due to MU’s lack of effort in moving toward equality, while others thought it was absurd to cut the budget at all.

Rep. Rick Brattin, R-Harrisonville, voted for HB 2003 to pass, saying that the university shouldn’t fret over the loss of such minimal funding. He had earlier referred to MU as a “resort” with its rock wall and lazy river.

Speaker Pro Tem Denny Hoskins, R-Warrensburg, sees the budget cut as means of improvement for MU, calling out the university for their problems, which are “out of control.” Hoskins voted yes on the bill.

The appropriations bill also included a 2 percent increase to institutions of higher education outside of the UM System.

“They are there to learn, not to protest all day long,” Lichtenegger told the Tribune in February. “I thought we learned that lesson in the ’60s. Obviously we haven’t.”

After incidents of racism came to light during the fall 2015 semester, Rep. Courtney Allen Curtis, D-Ferguson, said during the debate that he believes the university should see major budget cuts in the upcoming year. However, he voted no on the bill because he thought the cuts to be too small.

The $1 million taken from MU will be transferred to Lincoln University in Jefferson City. Rep. Kip Kendrick, D-Columbia, said he thinks this action is useless.

The next steps

Per the budget process outlined on the legislature’s website, the bill will be sent to the state senate where they will consider and potentially amend the bill. If the Senate makes any changes, the budget bill will be sent back to the House.
The budgets bills will then be sent to Nixon.

**Impact at MU**

If the funding cuts make it through the Senate, the budget problems for MU will worsen. On Wednesday, interim Chancellor Hank Foley announced that MU would be down $32 million for the next year. To make up for the loss, there will be a hiring freeze and a 5 percent budget cut across the board.

The UM System Operating budget totals $3 billion. The $7.6 million in cuts are targeted at the UM System administration. Foley said in his letter that those cuts would be shared by the four campuses so that the system offices can still be carried on.

“We at MU would probably bear a significant percent of the system reduction in order to maintain treasury, legal counsel, benefits administration and other services system administers,” Foley wrote.

The budget loss is a result of decreasing enrollment. MU has received 23 percent fewer deposits compared to this time last year, interim Vice Provost for Enrollment Management Barbara Rupp told Faculty Council on Thursday.

Since 2004, tuition and fees have been the largest source of revenue for the UM System. Officials with the UM System have long said that state appropriations have not kept up with the system’s growing enrollment and operating budget.

---
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**Future uncertain for Missouri GOP’s effort to defund Planned Parenthood**

Low-income patients couldn’t use Medicaid for Planned Parenthood health care, including vaccinations

---

Federal courts have blocked similar attempts in several states

*The Associated Press*

JEFFERSON CITY, Mo. – Missouri lawmakers’ effort to strip Planned Parenthood of any state money faces an uncertain path forward.
While the House passed a budget this week that bars any entity that provides or counsels a woman to get a non-emergency abortion from receiving Medicaid reimbursements, courts have blocked similar attempts in other states and the Senate’s budget writers have so far declined to endorse the effort.

It’s the latest in a series of Republican proposals that would regulate Planned Parenthood, whose St. Louis clinic is the only center offering elective abortions in Missouri.

Lawmakers also have proposed requiring more inspections of abortion facilities, a more comprehensive system for tracking fetal remains and a ban on a common second-trimester abortion method.

Under the new proposal, low-income patients would be blocked from using Medicaid for any health care service provided by Planned Parenthood – services such as HPV vaccinations and vaginal exams. Lawmakers removed about $379,000 from the budget, too, which is roughly what the state annually pays Planned Parenthood for such services.

By law, state money can’t fund nonemergency abortions. But Rep. Robert Ross, the Yukon Republican who inserted the exclusionary wording, said he thinks Planned Parenthood still does so, though he is not sure how.

“There is nothing that would make me believe that Planned Parenthood is not, at the present time, spending our taxpayer dollars for abortions,” he told The Associated Press. The only way to guarantee the organization does not illicitly use state money, he said, is to remove all its public funding.

The state House and Senate began investigations last year after undercover videos emerged alleging Planned Parenthood officials were selling fetal tissue for profit, which the group denied.

Democratic Attorney General Chris Koster has said his office found no evidence of wrongdoing in Missouri.

A Texas grand jury recently cleared Planned Parenthood and instead indicted two anti-abortion advocates involved in making the videos.

**Missouri lawmakers also have questioned agreements between the University of Missouri’s Columbia campus and a Planned Parenthood**
clinic last summer; the university ended a Planned Parenthood doctor’s “refer and follow” privileges in December, and the clinic stopped offering non-surgical abortions in November. Lawmakers also threatened to hold Planned Parenthood officials in contempt for refusing to turn over documents that the organization says contain private information about patients.

Planned Parenthood officials say Ross’ allegations are false. And GOP Sen. David Sater, vice chairman of the Senate committee that investigated Planned Parenthood, said he is sure that “not one dollar” improperly goes toward abortions.

Lawmakers in neighboring states have gone after Planned Parenthood, too.

Kansas Gov. Sam Brownback said in January that his state is moving to cut off Medicaid funding for the organization, though Planned Parenthood says it is still receiving payments. Federal courts have blocked similar attempts to cut Medicaid funding in Arkansas, Louisiana, Utah, Arizona and Indiana.

“Planned Parenthood’s doors remain open just like they have in every other state where legislators’ have unsuccessfully attempted to block Medicaid funding,” said Bonyen Lee-Gilmore, a spokeswoman for Planned Parenthood of Kansas and Mid-Missouri. “We refuse to back down to threats motivated by political ladder climbing and gamesmanship.”

Sater and Sen. Kurt Schaefer, the Columbia Republican who is chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the committee that investigated Planned Parenthood, said they haven’t yet decided whether to support the budget measure.

**Repercussions of climate change, not debate over its existence, dominate MU conference**
Richard Alley wasn’t pulling any punches Saturday morning.

As the Penn State professor and environmental scientist addressed the crowd at the MU Life Sciences and Society Symposium, he made it clear that he was not interested in a debate about whether climate change was occurring or whether people have caused it. Instead, he wanted to give people context and talk about paths to wider use of new sources of energy to substitute for fossil fuels.

He held up his cellphone in front of the crowd, an example, he said, of how humans have used science to make incredible things out of sand, oil and “the right rocks.” But, still, some people bristle at ideas put forth by the scientific community.

“I have gotten emails that say ‘you scientists are evil liars. I hope you suffer personally. … I am trying to get you fired,’” he told the crowd. “And the irony of doing that with a cellphone seems to be lost.”

Life Sciences and Society Director Mary Shenk said that when organizing the symposium, she made a concerted effort to make sure the speakers focused on exploring the way climate change might affect people and how its effects might be mitigated rather than engaging about a debate over the science. There is widespread acceptance in the scientific community about the existence of climate change.

“This conference is going to focus more on what people are actually doing to try to address climate change in their own communities,” she said. “Honestly my expectation is that” the politics of climate change “are going to come up. … There’s no way you can avoid it.”

The symposium picks up again Thursday and runs through Sunday. Scheduled speakers plan to talk about topics including climate change’s effect on agriculture and human health.

Alley focused his presentation on human use of energy.

People, he said, have a history of using fuel sources much faster than they can regenerate — such as trees — and then moving on to a different energy source when the most recent one used has been sufficiently depleted.

This, he argued, is exactly what is happening with current use of fossil fuels, which he said people need to promptly start moving away from, in part because carbon emissions are wreaking havoc on the global climate and in part because it is a finite resource being quickly used up.

The answer, he said, is in renewable energy sources such as solar and wind energy. He said he hopes that in the next three decades, the world can make significant strides and rely on these energy sources more and more, helping to slow human contributions to climate change.
“You look at this and we have a long history,” he said of people. “We were hunter-gatherers of food,” before agriculture. “But we now know, for the first time, how to be farmers of energy.”

University of Missouri warns against fraudulent fundraisers

Friday, March 11, 2016 at 2:00 pm

The University of Missouri is warning people of a scam involving people selling magazine subscriptions under the guise of raising money for the Thompson Center for Autism and Neurodevelopmental Disorders, according to a news release.

MU issued the warning Thursday after officials became aware of people going to homes and soliciting residents on behalf of the center, the release said. People selling the fraudulent subscriptions are not affiliated with the university, and people should refuse to buy any subscriptions and call police, the release said.

Stephen Kanne, executive director of the Thompson Center, said in the release that the center “does not raise money through selling subscriptions of any kind or from going door-to-door.”

Scammers pose as Thompson Center supporters

COLUMBIA, Mo - MU’s Thompson Center is warning the community of a scam that is going around that claims the proceeds are going to the center's research facility.

MU’s Thompson Center for Autism and Neurodevelopmental Disorders confirms that people are illegally going door to door selling magazine subscriptions saying it's all to benefit children with autism at the center.
The Thompson Center says they heard of some speculation about a month ago of the potential scam and today, the center got it confirmed.

Salesmen going door to door, isn't a stranger to neighborhoods in Mid- Missouri. Salesmen pitching to potential buyers that the money that is spent on subscriptions that will go to a good cause.

The Thompson Center however denies this way of fundraising. "We got a phone call from a person who subscribed to the magazine. They gave us a call asking if it was legitimate and we don't that person, we don't fund raise that way."

The Thompson Center says when they first got the call from the subscriber, they were shocked. Stephen Kanne, Executive Director of the facility said, "it kind of took us by surprise to be honest with you. Why would people be going around using our name and preying upon people to use to solicit money and keeping it for themselves."

The Thompson Center wants to advise the community to not accept any kind of sale from an individual who is trying to sell products on behalf of the facility. If you do wish to donate, you can go onto the centers website.

Some other helpful ways to avoid scammers, is to ask where they are from, get the details in form of a contract, and to always verify with the better business bureau if the business seems suspicious.
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Steve Kraske: Protests like the one in Kansas City will dog Donald Trump for months

Looking down the road, Donald Trump may well see this over and over again — the pepper spray, the walls of angry protesters, the lines of police with their horses and flak jackets.

What happened in Kansas City on Saturday night, and preceding days in Chicago and Dayton and St. Louis, is destined to become a staple of the 2016 political campaign with perhaps profound consequences.

Trump, the GOP frontrunner, has tapped into a geyser of anger and frustration. He’s added to that with his own incendiary rhetoric about racist Mexican immigrants, our “incompetent” president and the need to knock “the crap” out of certain people.
In Kansas City, he threatened to ratchet up the consequences for those “professional disrupters,” as he calls them, who infiltrate his events and knock him off-stride. He now says he wants them arrested.

As the numbers of protesters expand, it’s clear that some Americans have had enough.

Once again on the Sunday morning talk shows, Trump refused to ease up, to “ratchet it back,” in the words of “Meet the Press” moderator Chuck Todd.

“Well ... I’m just expressing my opinion,” Trump told Todd. “What have I said that’s wrong? I mean, I talk about illegal immigration, I talk about building a wall, I say Mexico’s going to pay for the wall, which they will. And all of these things. I mean, what have I said that’s wrong? You tell me.”

Douse the flames that now threaten to overrun the Republican Party? No thanks. Hillary Clinton has a name for what Trump’s doing — “political arson.”

“If you play with matches, you can start a fire you can’t control,” she said. That, she said, is exactly what’s happened.

So brace yourselves, folks. If this raucous campaign has been too much to swallow, you may soon be gagging on what’s to come.

For the older generation, this next phase of the campaign may well bring memories of the far more bloody Chicago clashes that consumed the 1968 convention when Vietnam and “burn, baby, burn” rioting poured down big-city streets.

For others, the notion that political rhetoric can induce violence — so familiar in Europe — will be something new and altogether frightening.

“The events over the past week have sort of changed the tenor of the campaign,” said University of Missouri political scientist Peverill Squire. “Things have become so conflictual, and Trump’s response has been so harsh that I suspect that a lot of Republicans are going to be very uncomfortable being associated with the Trump campaign.”

Of course, we’ve heard this before. Trump is Houdini-like in his ability to escape near-death political experiences and not only survive, but thrive even in a crowded field.
“What the press is criticizing is exactly what Trump supporters find appealing,” said Patrick Miller, a University of Kansas political scientist. “If you’re a Trump supporter, this reinforces your predisposition that he’s a strong leader.”

So far, all this has played to Trump’s benefit in a primary contest in which he’s demonstrated impressive, and consistent, strength through the first 24 contests. Tuesday presents another set of tests. He leads in early polls in Missouri and has an even bigger lead in the key state of Florida that, if it holds, could knock rival Marco Rubio from the race.

He’s also easily ahead in Illinois and North Carolina, and trails only narrowly in Ohio.

In other words, Trump is positioned to run the table and effectively end the nomination race, which would rank as a powerhouse performance considering that he faced a dozen candidates only six weeks ago.

But primaries are altogether different competitions from general elections, where the battle over independents and undecided voters forces candidates to jettison their more flamboyant, playing-to-the-base rhetoric in favor of more responsible, centrist appeals.

Broad protests are likely to continue should Trump win the nomination and campaign for the White House.

Weeks of TV news footage of police officers muscling protesters won’t help Trump with that endeavor. He already trails both Clinton and Bernie Sanders in national polling.

The sudden change in the tenor of Trump events has caused rivals, who had pledged to back the real estate tycoon should he become the GOP nominee, to now hesitate.

Rubio acknowledged that it’s getting tougher by the day to back Trump. Ohio Gov. John Kasich, who has steadfastly worked to remain this campaign’s happy warrior, now talks about the “toxic environment” that Trump has created. On Sunday, he admitted that supporting Trump would be tough.

On NBC Sunday, Texas Sen. Ted Cruz said, “When you have a campaign that disrespects the voters, when you have a campaign that affirmatively encourages
violence, you create an environment that only encourages this sort of nasty discourse.”

On Sunday, Trump threatened to start sending some of his own supporters into Sanders’ events because Trump is convinced that’s where many of the disrupters originate. He warned Sanders in a tweet to “be careful” but denied that was a threat.

“If conservative Republicans ever went into his rally, you would see things happen that would be unbelievable,” Trump said on CNN.

No question that the regular interruptions of Trump’s stump speech in Kansas City were well-planned. They forced Trump to halt more than half a dozen times as police removed one demonstrator after another, including one dressed in a suit and tie.

Outside The Midland in the hours that preceded the event, Trump’s supporters stayed calm even as the anti-Trump protesters sought to provoke. At various times, the Trump backers chanted, “Respect all people” and “We love Mexicans.”

Over and over again, purple-haired Liz Blumenthal of Kansas City paraded right in front of them with a sign reading, “A vote for Trump is a vote for hate.” The Trump backers never engaged her.

More than one came up to me to insist that Trump backers weren’t racist and they weren’t violent.

But Trump’s patience and that of his followers are about to be tested anew. The protesters aren’t going away. It happened again near Cincinnati on Sunday when Trump was interrupted early in his speech.

“Well, it adds excitement, doesn’t it folks?” Trump said. “In certain ways it makes it more exciting.”

MISSOURIAN
FACT CHECK: Rowden mostly right about Missouri residents supporting voter ID

KATIE MOELLER/POLITIFACT MISSOURI, 15 hrs ago

“Seventy percent of Missourians support voter photo ID legislation.”

— Rep. Caleb Rowden, R-Columbia

Feb. 4 at Columbia/Boone County League of Women Voters Town Hall

COLUMBIA — The debate over whether to require photo identification to vote continues in Missouri. Republicans argue photo IDs are necessary to safeguard the voting process from fraud, while Democrats warn that legislation would disenfranchise minority and poor voters.

At a League of Women Voters’ town hall meeting in Columbia, state Rep. Caleb Rowden said most people are behind the idea. The Columbia Republican said “70 percent of Missourians support voter photo ID legislation.”

We decided to look into that.

Rowden said he based his 70 percent figure on a poll conducted by Remington Research in Missouri Scout, a political subscription service. He also said he has internally polled the district he represents.

The survey Rowden cited put the question this way: “The legislature is proposing to require voters to show a valid Missouri driver’s license or other valid identification in order to vote. Do you agree or disagree with this?”

Remington’s poll said 70 percent of Missourians said they agreed, with results varying city-to-city.
The hitch is that the poll does not clarify what “other valid identification” entails. Defining what does and does not constitute “valid identification” is the crux of a proposed Missouri bill.

As Missouri law stands now, any form of ID issued by Missouri, the federal government or another state is accepted as proof of identity to vote. Those forms include driver’s licenses from another state, birth certificates, student IDs, utility bills and bank statements. Not all of those include a photo.

In contrast, the Missouri bill would require one of four documents, all of which include photos: a Missouri driver’s license; a Missouri non-driver’s license (state ID); a military ID; or a national government-issued form of ID with a signature and photograph.

Marvin Overby, MU professor of political science at , said changes in phrasing when it comes to survey research can lead to different results.

“To a lot of people, it’s just common-sense rhetoric that you need a photo ID to do lots of things in life, including voting,” he said. “But if the wording laid out more exact points, such as the fact that the proposed legislation doesn’t include student IDs or out-of-state licenses, you might get a different response.”

That said, evidence from national polling suggests Rowden might be on solid ground.

Nationwide support for photo ID

The Pew Research Center found that 77 percent of Americans supported photo voter ID requirements.

A poll conducted by Rasmussen Reports this summer illustrated a similar trend, showing more than three-quarters of Americans in favor of requiring a photo ID to vote. That poll asked, “Should voters be required to show photo identification such as a driver’s license before being allowed to vote?”
Unlike the poll cited by Rowden, the Rasmussen Reports poll specifically defined a valid ID as one requiring a photo.

Rasmussen Reports Managing Editor Fran Coombs said the goal is to keep any potential bias out of survey questions.

“As a rule, we just try to keep the questioning as simple as possible,” she said. “The important thing is not to influence the responses with the wording of the question.”

Even those who disagree with the idea of requiring photo identification don’t dispute that surveys show a high level of support for the idea. Missouri’s League of Women Voters’ Voter Protection and Service Director Kathleen Farrell said people might not know the details of the legislation that surveys ask about.

“The average person might not know just how strict Missouri’s proposed legislation is,” she said. “They also may not know how expensive it could be to require photo ID for all voters.”

The bill’s fiscal note allows for up to about $10.7 million dollars of funding — if the necessary funds were not allocated, the requirements for photo identification to vote would not be implemented.

**Our ruling**

Rowden’s statement that “70 percent of Missourians support voter photo ID identification” isn’t fully supported by the poll he provided. The poll Rowden cited only asks about “requiring Missouri driver’s licenses or other valid form of ID to vote.” It doesn’t specify that the proposed legislation restricts valid identification to IDs that have photos.

But national polls show about 75 percent of Americans support requiring a photo ID to vote. The wording in the poll Rowden cited is confusing, but the results mirror the national trend. **We rate this statement Mostly True.**
The fact that women face sexual harassment in academe is not news. But doesn’t that make the fact that it’s still so pervasive, and so pernicious, even more inexcusable?

A. Hope Jahren’s opinion article in The New York Times this month could serve as a catalyst on this issue. Ms. Jahren, a professor of geobiology at the University of Hawaii-Manoa, wrote about the harassment that her female peers in the sciences typically face from male colleagues in a way that reads almost like notes on field observations.

She described the initial disclosure of feelings — usually through email, and often acknowledged by their author as inappropriate. She cataloged the surprise and anxiety such contact creates, and the impulse to ignore it in hopes that it will go away. She noted how such overtures tend to build toward social invitations, and toward uninvited physical contact, and the trepidation that builds in the subject of these attentions as they become bolder. She discussed the powerlessness that many female students and researchers feel in the shadow of powerful male faculty members, and as parts of a system that often responds poorly, or not at all, to complaints about such behavior. She detailed the cost to science of sexual harassment: talented women who leave research and teaching rather than continue to face a hostile environment.

Her evidence is anecdotal, but it is consistent. And she wrote that such unwelcome advances "have been encountered by every single woman I know."
But what is most surprising, and depressing, about Ms. Jahren’s description of sexual harassment in the sciences is how utterly unsurprising it is. The pattern of the attempted seduction she described resembles the accusations leveled against male professors for years, including in recent high-profile cases such as that of Geoffrey W. Marcy, an astronomer at the University of California at Berkeley who resigned last year after repeated accusations that he violated the institution’s sexual-harassment policy.

Many colleges are now embroiled in difficult conversations about campus racial climate, and how to improve it. Those conversations were sparked by a wave of contentious protests. It is difficult to imagine female graduate students and faculty members taking to the campus quad with signs and bullhorns and demands. But until administrators and faculty members as a class take these problems seriously, attacking them at their very root — where future professors are trained — there will be no remedy for women in science, nor for the heartbreakingly resigned tone of Ms. Jahren’s piece.

Scapegoated?

**Neither academe, nor the University of Missouri, has heard the last of Melissa A. Click.** The American Association of University Professors announced last week that it would investigate the decision by the university’s Board of Curators last month to fire Ms. Click. Censure of the institution for violating her academic freedom is among the possible outcomes.

Ms. Click, who was an assistant professor of communication, was catapulted to national notoriety last fall after video of her attempting to block a student journalist from a protest by black students went viral. She apologized, but state policy makers made it clear that they wanted her gone. More than 100 of her colleagues signed a
letter expressing their support for Ms. Click. No one at the university ever lodged a formal complaint against her, which meant that her actions were not subject to official internal review. The Board of Curators took matters into its own hands.

Ms. Click, who is appealing her firing, applauded the AAUP’s decision to investigate. In her first public statement since the board’s decision, she accused the curators of listening to "conservative voices" in the legislature, and said that she had become a scapegoat for "standing with students who have drawn attention to the issue of overt racism at the University of Missouri."

Refugees

Sara Goldrick-Rab is well known within the worlds of sociology and education policy, and she’s verging on national renown, thanks to her vocal activism for lower-income students. That makes her departure from the University of Wisconsin at Madison noteworthy. But even more notable is the reason she provided for leaving — concerns over the future of tenure, and academic freedom, in Wisconsin.

Gov. Scott Walker, a Republican, engineered the removal of tenure protections from state law last year. The university’s Board of Regents subsequently passed internal policies designed to bolster tenure protections. Ms. Goldrick-Rab, who inspired calls for her dismissal last year for mentioning similarities between Mr. Walker and Adolf Hitler on Twitter, dismisses the system’s new policies with the hashtag "#FakeTenure." In a blog post announcing her move to a new position at Temple University, she writes that "firing me would be quite easy" at Wisconsin now, thanks to the compromised state of tenure, and that many of her tenured colleagues at Madison are now "terrified sheep."

Ms. Goldrick-Rab’s announcement comes on the heels of news that Larycia A. Hawkins, a political scientist, will join the faculty at the University of Virginia after
being put on leave by Wheaton College, an evangelical Christian college in Illinois, for stating that Muslims and Christians "worship the same God," a view it found inconsistent with its statement of faith.

Frederick R. (Fritz) Steiner recently announced he would step down as dean of the School of Architecture at the University of Texas at Austin in favor of a position at the University of Pennsylvania in part because of a new Texas law that will allow students to carry firearms on campus.

It isn’t uncommon for distinguished faculty members to be lured to new positions even when everything is rosy, and Mr. Steiner, for one, has said that factors other than guns played into his decision. But the recent high-profile departures hint at a possible exodus of scholars, who are often politically liberal, from states and institutions increasingly influenced by conservative policy makers and administrators. Of course, scholars with lower profiles may not have so many options.

Symbolic Gestures

Harvard University became the latest major institution to alter a key part of its physical identity to accommodate concerns about honoring a dubious historical figure. Martha L. Minow, dean of the Harvard Law School, announced that she would recommend the school retire its shield — its de facto logo — which was based on a bookplate belonging to the family of Isaac Royall Jr., an early donor to the law school and a slaveholder.

Meanwhile, Stanford University is taking perhaps the next logical step in dealing with the recent tide of questions over how to handle contentious symbols. The university’s leadership announced this month that it would establish a committee to devise principles for considering and renaming streets and buildings on campus. The new committee’s first task will be to tackle the case of Junípero Serra, a Roman Catholic priest who established missions throughout California and was elevated to
sainthood by Pope Francis last year. The Stanford Undergraduate Senate introduced a bill this year to consider renaming a street on the campus that bears Father Serra’s name, because of his association with the cultural repression and genocide of Native Americans in California.

Testing, Testing ...

Hundreds of thousands of high-school students took a new version of the venerable SAT exam this month. A survey of more than 8,000 people who took the new test preferred it over the previous version by a factor of 6 to 1, according to the College Board, which owns and designs the test. Students’ own unfiltered reactions on social media were mixed to the point of unhelpful equivocalness. Colleges will have to make their own judgments on how well the new test measures college readiness when the students who took the new test start showing up in their classrooms.