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Melissa Click: What would our world be like if no one ever took a chance?

By Melissa Click March 17 at 1:03 PM

Last fall, student protesters forced dramatic change at the University of Missouri after they demanded a better response from leaders to race and bias incidents on campus.

An assistant professor was caught on film during the demonstrations pushing a student journalist away from a student protest camp, and also was shown on camera yelling at police during Missouri's homecoming parade — videos that went viral. Earlier this week, the state university system's governing body, the Board of Curators, voted to uphold their decision to terminate her.

Click's termination was criticized by the American Association of University Professors, which launched an investigation that could result in the organization censuring the University of Missouri. On Thursday, the Board of Curators responded that the decision “does not threaten academic tenure and does not warrant censure.”

A spokeswoman for the AAUP said they will continue with the investigation planned for next week.

Here, Melissa Click reflects on the response to the videos. — Susan Svrluga

By Melissa Click

Here in Columbia, the University of Missouri homecoming parade is a big deal, so arriving early to grab a spot last October was crucial.

Getting out the door with a young family on a Saturday morning however, can be a bit of a struggle and my thoughts that morning were dominated by the usual worries of anyone rushing out to the door to a much-anticipated event. Grateful to have found a spot that would accommodate us just moments before the parade began, we were frustrated when the candy throwing and band marching unexpectedly stopped.
When I walked the block between us and the impasse and found myself suddenly in the presence of an unfolding political demonstration, I was immediately faced with a question of conscience. A question I hadn’t anticipated when I hurriedly got ready that morning: Would I remain a spectator, or would I stand with these students enduring disparagement from the bystanders who wished the parade to continue unhindered?

If you have had any exposure to American media in the last four months, you know the quick decision I made to stand with the students, you’ve seen my inexperience with public protests, and you’ve heard my apologies for the mistakes I made while offering my support to the students working to make MU a more inclusive environment.

Among the debates and judgments the video footage of my mistakes has attracted, few have sincerely grappled with the sudden choices I had to make in challenging circumstances, and fewer still have earnestly asked whether my protected right to speak out as a US citizen requires that I must be perfect while doing so.

As a Media Studies scholar, I understand how the increased surveillance resulting from advances in technology like digital recording and wireless broadband has come to mean that our mistakes will be widely broadcast — typically without context or rights of rebuttal — exposing us to unprecedented public scrutiny.

But I do not understand the widespread impulse to shame those whose best intentions unfortunately result in imperfect actions. What would our world be like if no one ever took a chance? What if everyone played it safe?
Sites like YouTube and Twitter host forums in which everyday people are subjected to the kinds of excoriation we have typically reserved for politicians and celebrities — those whose public and private actions, due to their vocations, are judged within the public sphere.

In recent years, however, earnest mistakes made by ordinary, unknown people have increasingly become national topics, their errors invoking astonishing amounts of political fury and having unanticipated impact on their careers, families, and futures.

Reaction to the footage containing my errors has resulted in months of scrutiny and most recently the loss of my job.

While I never used my authority as a professor in the actions I took, the University of Missouri’s Collected Rules and Regulations, the guidelines that govern my employment, indicate that standards of excellence do not equate to perfection.

MU has procedures in place to evaluate faculty whose conduct has come into question, but the Board of Curators, under pressure from a state legislature holding MU’s annual budget hostage, has refused to follow those procedures. Instead, the Curators’ actions — and the nationwide public outcry over these few recorded moments of my actions — wholly disregard the overwhelming evidence of my outstanding contributions to MU: student evaluations, teaching awards, research and publications, service to professional organizations, and a solid case for tenure.

While I continue to fight the MU Board of Curators’ decision to terminate my employment without due process and in violation of university policy, I am
also working to come to terms with how a few captured moments of imperfection could eclipse 12 years of excellence.

But beyond my specific circumstances, I believe this situation raises broader cultural, ethical, and legal questions about how surveillance and social media significantly impact the terrain of public engagement.

Whose interests are served when our drive to combat societal imperfections is defeated by fears of having our individual imperfections exposed?

And what value do our rights as citizens have in a culture increasingly ruled by snap judgments and by regulations that are easily rewritten to suit changing political interests?

We should all be concerned about the larger issues my situation raises.

I don’t want to live in a world where citizens are too afraid of public scorn to take a chance. Do you?

**ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH**

**Millennials more likely than older adults to donate clothing rather than trash it**

*COLUMBIA, Mo. •* In 2012, Americans sent more than 14 million tons of textile waste to trash dumps around the country, despite many options for consumers to repurpose or recycle textile waste, including donating old clothes to charities and recycling the materials to be remade into other products.
Pamela Norum, professor and interim department chair of textile and apparel management at the University of Missouri, found that younger adults from ages 18-34 are much less likely to throw old clothes and other textile waste into the garbage than older adults.

She also found that millennials were more likely to donate clothing to secondhand stores such as Goodwill and the Salvation Army.

"It was surprising to see that older adults were less likely to donate to secondhand stores and more likely to use the trash than younger adults," Norum said. "Baby Boomers grew up when the recycling culture was coming of age, so we thought they would be more willing to recycle their used clothes rather than throwing them in the trash. However, it was gratifying to see that younger Americans are more likely to recycle textiles; hopefully they will carry on that behavior into the future."

For her study, Norum examined data from a 2012 survey of more than 500 U.S. consumers. Overall, she found:

- 65 percent donated at least some clothing to charity
- 50 percent donated to non-profit secondhand stores
- 40 percent of Americans threw away at least some clothing
- Consumers 55 years and older were more likely to donate money to charities than millennials

Norum also found consumers dispose of their clothes for various reasons including clothing that was out of style or the wrong size; they were running out of storage space; and clothes were old or damaged. Norum says it is important for consumers to be educated about all the possibilities for recycling and re-using old clothes, so waste can be reduced.
"Nearly all textiles can be recycled or re-used in some way, even underwear," Norum said. "Lightly worn clothing can always be donated to charities and secondhand stores; more degraded fabrics can be cut up and made into rags or given to textile recyclers who can break down the materials and use them to manufacture new fabrics or other textile products. With all of these easy and free options for recycling, little excuse exists for throwing away clothing, especially if it is simply out of style or the wrong size."

The study was published in the Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal.
But amid the news, officials noted that alumni and other donors had not deserted MU. Through February of its current fiscal year, which runs through June, the Columbia campus’ foundation has raised $114.7 million. That’s ahead of the $107.9 million it had raised through February in its best fundraising year, fiscal 2014.

A check of other area campuses — the University of Kansas, Kansas State University and the University of Missouri-Kansas City — also found that none of them could match MU’s enrollment growth in the past decade.

KU, in fact, had fall 2015 enrollment that was 5.1 percent lower than in fall 2006. K-State’s was up 4.3 percent, and UMKC’s rose a hefty 17.5 percent.

On the giving side, all the universities have substantial support, and KU’s endowment contributions have grown more than 170 percent in a decade. UMKC, without as much statewide presence, had the smallest totals. But it still received big contributions since its own foundation was set up for fiscal 2010, including a $32 million gift from Henry Bloch in fiscal 2012.

MU shifts its liabilities to sick, elderly

By KAREN PIPER

The University of Missouri claims it cannot afford to pay its debts and has decided to make its sick and elderly pay instead. Retiree health insurance has to be cut, the MU Benefits Task Force says, because the university did not set aside money to pay for it. With health care premiums escalating at an unprecedented rate, the task force claims, MU can no longer afford to cover this cost. It thinks we can.

If you are faculty or staff only a few years from retirement, you are one of the lucky ones. You will be able to keep your health insurance. In contrast, those who have been here fewer than five years will get nothing. The majority of employees are somewhere in between. We can buy university health care coverage, but only with a flat-rate subsidy of $2,500 per year, at best, from the university. MU
employee costs are now $640 a month for health care without the subsidy, and if premiums continue to rise at the current rate of 13.9 percent in Missouri’s marketplace, we could be paying $2,100 a month in premiums in 10 years.

Admittedly, the task force claims the university policy premiums are not increasing as quickly as the state’s, but this will not matter to future and early employees who will not be offered university insurance. This tiered strategy of cuts, which has made some employees feel safe and others angry, might also put the university at risk of a class action lawsuit because our current regulations say any adjustments to salary and benefits must be "across the board on an equitable basis to all similarly situated University officers and employees."

Task force leader Kris Hagglund says “everyone” is cutting health care and claims he had a mandate from former University of Missouri System President Tim Wolfe to do so. Have we already forgotten the mistakes that Wolfe and Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin made, including cutting graduate student health care? When I first met Wolfe at a faculty council meeting, he gave a corporate-lingo-laden speech peppered with unfamiliar acronyms. Several faculty members interrupted him for clarification. He replied, “Sorry. I thought I was at IBM.” Around the same time, both the chancellor and president started calling faculty the “lower levels.” I warned people we were in for trouble then and was not surprised when they were finally forced to resign.

The University of Georgia recently cut only its post-65 supplemental insurance, but because Medicare covers only around 80 percent of medical costs and many doctors refuse to take Medicare, people were enraged. The retiree association president complained of having to call people who were “quite elderly and/or hard of hearing; some may be bordering on dementia" to inform them they had lost their health care. He said, “Many are angry, frightened and befuddled.” Unlike Georgia, MU is not cutting its current retirees, but it is cutting pre- and post-65 insurance for future retirees. Salon magazine wrote of similar cuts at Mount St. Mary’s: “When universities are run like corporations, is it any wonder when CEO-presidents act with an iron fist?”

As for “everyone” doing it, I cannot find the evidence to support this. According to the August 2015 Hechinger Report, “90 percent of universities still offer it; more than one in 10 pays employees’ full premiums, and half share the cost with their retirees.” Harvard employees voted unanimously against less severe cuts than MU's. The University of Michigan voted against retiree health care cuts in 2014, claiming it would make the university uncompetitive.
The MU task force admits the lack of pre-Medicare insurance might cause people to work until 65 — or 67 if Medicare eligibility changes. Obamacare is still pricier than employee programs, which would mean a draconian pay cut for retirees. I asked task force members, “So you really think it’s a good idea to make everyone work until they’re 65?” Their reply: “Yes, it will definitely save us money. We’ve already calculated that. A lot of people want to work until 65, anyway.” And what about those who get sick and have to retire before 65? Their reply: “They can get long-term disability and try to keep working.”

Ironically, most universities are worried about an aging workforce, and even MU recently offered early retirement incentives to free up money for “signature” hires. Given that we are the lowest-paid faculty in the United States and have a “strategic operation plan” that rewards the top 20 percent while giving nothing to the rest, it is hard to imagine this helping recruitment. It is also discouraging when the task force threatens to cut everyone’s salaries by $1,200 a month if we do not go along with this plan.

I think it is time for us to face up to Wolfe’s mistakes and move on to a more humane era, one in which MU is competitive and thriving again.

---

**Greitens hammered over $1 million donation at GOP governor’s debate**

Eric Greitens found himself fending off questions about a controversial donor at Thursday’s Missouri Republican gubernatorial debate in Columbia, the first one this year to be televised.

Both Catherine Hanaway and Peter Kinder called on Greitens to return a $1 million campaign contribution from Michael Goguen. The California venture capitalist is being sued by a woman who accuses him of holding her as a sex slave for 13 years.
"This election is going to come down to who do you trust," Hanaway said. "It's time for Eric Greitens to send his contribution back, or better yet, send it to a shelter for abused women!"

Greitens responded, "Well, unlike career politicians, I'm not going to convict someone in the court of public opinion ... let's see how this civil case works itself out, so that we can make a decision based on the facts and the judgments."

He then launched an attack on Hanaway, accusing her of lying about her position on conceal-carry gun laws, which was legalized when she was speaker of the Missouri House.

"The fact is, she voted against conceal-carry in 2003," the former Navy SEAL said. "She was against conceal-carry in 2002, (and) she was against conceal-carry in 1999."

Hanaway, a former Missouri House Speaker, defended herself by saying she engineered the override of Gov. Bob Holden's veto that resulted in conceal-carry becoming law.

"Nice diversionary tactic, Eric!" she said. "But I don't want to walk away from this issue of an abused woman ... powerful men always try to suppress their (victims') voices, (and) you should allow this woman's voice to be heard!"

Kinder also piled on later:

"Eric, I don't think you're going to be able to maintain this with your million-dollar donor. I do not believe you're going to be able to maintain this. What the man has already admitted to has caused his former business associates to sever ties with him. (Presidential candidate) John Kasich did the honorable, stand-up thing of giving back the money within a few hours of hearing about it."
Greitens hit back hard: "You're the last person on this stage, sir, who should be trafficking in tabloid stories about men hanging out in strip clubs."

Kinder's visits to strip clubs when he was a senator in the 1990s was used against him in 2011, which led him to drop out of the 2012 governor's race. He ran again for lieutenant governor, though, and won a third term.

Kinder brushed that barb aside by reminding the audience that Greitens was a Democrat "18 months ago," and that he's played no role in any battle for conservative causes in Missouri.

Greitens then brought out his military record: "I'm very proud of my service in southeast Asia, in the Horn of Africa, in Iraq, (and) in Afghanistan ...while you were playing politics as a career politician, I was out on the field of battle happily defending our constitution that I took an oath to defend!"

After the debate, he was peppered again with questions, this time from the media, about the $1 million donation. Greitens refused to say if or when he might return the money.

"We're going to let the facts play out, guys. ... I know that you're desperate for me to jump to judgment, (but) I will not jump to judgment," he told reporters. "I'm not going to convict anyone based on what happens in a media story, and I will not collapse in the face of the attacks from career politicians and their allies in the media."

St. Louis businessman John Brunner, who has had many scrapes with Greitens on the campaign trail, stayed out of this particular fight, which unfolded on the stage of the Missouri Theater.

**Candidates' stands on marijuana legalization**
The four Republican contenders, for the most part, lined up on the issues. In answering a question about legalizing recreational marijuana use, all four opposed it, although most of them showed some interest in allowing it for medical use.

"The bigger issue dealing (with) marijuana (should be) for tax resources, revenues," Brunner said. "It's all about jobs. It's about getting this economy back on track."

Kinder said that he's on record supporting medical use of marijuana, but strongly opposes legalizing it for recreational use.

"The Democratic governor of Colorado, Mr. (John) Hickenlooper, has said that legalization step they took a few years ago was a mistake," he said.

Hanaway, a former prosecutor, opposes legalizing marijuana for both recreational and medical use, but said she's "open to seeing more science."

Greitens' answer got a few laughs: "There is no stoned path to prosperity, folks." He did express support for the use of CBD oil for children with epilepsy and similar diagnoses.

**University of Missouri budget cuts**

Questions remain as to whether Kinder, Hanaway, Brunner or Greitens would reverse funding cuts proposed by lawmakers this year for the University of Missouri System. Kinder said the real issue is a lack of leadership from the board of curators and Gov. Jay Nixon.

"I hear you, Missourians, across this state," Kinder said while looking directly into a TV camera. "What I'm hearing is you've had a bellyful of what has gone on on the campus of the University of Missouri here in Columbia. We have had a massive failure of leadership from the governor's mansion on down,
and I hear you. We've had a governor who, just as in Ferguson, hid out in the mansion, instead of coming over here and exerting some kind of leadership."

Hanaway said she'd restore funding cuts, but only if university leaders are "responsive to the concerns of the people and the legislature."

Greitens said the next governor should plan a "fantastic university," then build the budget around it. Brunner said university funding should be the result of meeting "clear goals and objectives."

Thursday's debate was televised live by KOMU, which is owned and operated by the University of Missouri - Columbia. The TV station and the Columbia Chamber of Commerce are planning a second televised debate this fall featuring the Republican and Democratic nominees for governor.

Follow Marshall Griffin on Twitter: @MarshallGReport
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Missouri GOP gubernatorial hopefuls differ little on policy, but sparks still fly at debate

All support right-to-work law, reducing income taxes

But donation to Eric Greitens by a man under investigation draws fire

Catherine Hanaway, Peter Kinder target the former Navy SEAL, but John Brunner focuses on own biography

BY JASON HANCEK
jhancock@kcstar.com
COLUMBIA - Policy disagreements were few and far between Thursday night as the four candidates seeking the Republican nomination for Missouri governor faced off in the first real debate of the campaign season.

But that doesn’t mean there weren’t fireworks, as the candidates briefly traded barbs over a scandal-plagued donor, strip club rumors and party loyalty.

Businessman John Brunner, former Navy SEAL Eric Greitens, former Missouri House Speaker Catherine Hanaway and Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder laid out similar platforms of policy solutions that they say set them apart from the likely Democratic nominee, Missouri Attorney General Chris Koster.

All four said they’d immediately sign a right-to-work law, and each voiced support for reducing income taxes. All four called for trimming regulations on businesses and opposed raising taxes to pump more money into Missouri’s roads and bridges.

**And all four pointed to unrest in Ferguson in 2014 and on the University of Missouri’s Columbia campus last year as examples of failed Democratic leadership.**

The fireworks didn’t begin until Hanaway noted the lack of policy differences between the candidates during a question on the minimum wage.

She used the question to pivot to an attack on Greitens for not returning $1 million in donations he received from Silicon Valley venture capitalist Michael Goguen, who was recently accused of holding a woman as a sex slave for 13 years.

A woman last week in California filed a suit against Goguen, saying he sexually abused her for more than a decade, agreed to pay her $40 million in response and then only gave her $10 million.

Goguen denied the allegations in court records, but a political action committee supporting Republican presidential hopeful John Kasich gave the donations it received from him to nonprofit groups working to end human trafficking.

Hanaway said Greitens should follow suit.

“If he doesn’t return the money, it raises serious questions about Mr. Greitens’ judgment and whom he surrounds himself with,” Hanaway said.
Greitens said he won’t convict someone in the court of public opinion, then slammed Hanaway as someone “you just can’t trust” because of a vote against the concealed carry of firearms when she served in the Missouri House.

These attacks “are what happens when desperate politicians get very desperate,” Greitens said.

Kinder piled on later, saying Greitens should “do the honorable thing” and return the money.

“I don’t believe you’ll be able to maintain your position of hanging on to his $1 million donations,” Kinder said, adding that the money is “tainted” and “stained.”

Greitens hit back by saying Kinder is “the last person on this stage who should be trafficking in tabloid stories about men hanging out in strip clubs.”

That’s a reference to a series of stories in 2011 about Kinder frequenting strip clubs in the early 1990s. The stories and resulting uproar caused Kinder to abandon his run for governor that year.

However, Kinder noted that after the stories broke and were used in campaign ads against him, he was still re-elected in 2012 to a third term as lieutenant governor.

He then angrily labeled Greitens a lifelong Democrat who didn’t become a Republican until deciding to run for governor last year. Even the debate moderator noted that Greitens attended the 2008 Democratic National Convention with former Democratic Gov. Bob Holden.

Greitens was recruited to run as a Democrat for Congress in 2010, but he says he’s always been a conservative even if he identified with the Democratic Party.

Brunner, who has previously been Greitens’ most vocal critic, largely stayed out of scrum Thursday night. Besides a couple subtle jabs at Greitens’ party loyalty and conservative credentials in his opening statement, Brunner focused on his biography as a business owner and first-time political candidate, saying he provides the best contrast to take on Koster, “a career politician.”
The Republican candidates for governor used a debate Thursday night to clash over big donations, blame Gov. Jay Nixon for turmoil on the University of Missouri campus and assert who has the right message to beat Democratic Attorney General Chris Koster.

The sharpest exchange came when former U.S. Attorney Catherine Hanaway departed from an answer about the minimum wage to question why former Navy SEAL Eric Greitens had not returned $1 million donated by a California businessman accused of sexual abuse in a civil lawsuit.

“It is time for” Greitens “to send the contribution back or send it to a shelter,” Hanaway said.

Greitens responded by calling the issue a distraction by a politician who knows she is losing.

“I think this is what happens when desperate politicians get very desperate,” Greitens said. “I like Catherine but you just can’t trust her.”

When Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder noted that the donor, Michael Gogeun’s business had severed its long-time ties and that should be enough to return the donation, Greitens attacked Kinder’s personal life.

“Peter, you are the last person on this stage who should traffic in tabloid stories about men who are hanging out in strip clubs,” he said, referring to a story that emerged in 2011 about Kinder’s romantic interest in a woman who was formerly a Penthouse Pet.

Businessman John Brunner, the fourth candidate, shied away from the issue during the debate.

The four candidates are locked in what is likely to be the most expensive primary contest in Missouri history. Candidates may take unlimited donations; Hanaway and Greitens have both taken donations
from a single source in excess of $1 million, while Brunner loaned $3 million to his campaign before
the end of the year.

The debate in Columbia is one of the first broadcast debates of the campaign that will last until
August. After that, the winner will likely take on Koster, a Democrat who has raised almost as much
as the entire GOP field and has no primary opponent.

The unrest at the university, which has dominated state and oftentimes national headlines
since November, should be blamed on Nixon and Koster, they said.

As the unrest justified cutting the university’s budget, the candidates talked about
accountability and the need to restore confidence. A poll conducted last week for 10 Missouri
newspapers including the Tribune indicated that 80 percent of voters oppose cutting the
university or increasing its state budget allocation.

“What I’m hearing is that ‘you’ve had a bellyful’ of what’s going on at the University of Missouri,”
Kinder said.

Hanaway and Kinder are running as effective public servants who can push the levers of
government and make it work.

Kinder argued that he is the most electable because he has won three statewide races and drawn a
higher-than-normal percentage of minority voters among Republicans. Hanaway lost a race for
secretary of state in 2004, while Brunner lost a Republican primary for U.S. Senate in 2012.

“We have got to have a governor who will stand up against the trial lawyers and labor union bosses,”
Kinder said.

Hanaway said she will bring a “bold five-point plan” to energize the state’s economy and education.
Regulatory reform is necessary, she said, noting that there are 10,000 words in the state barber
regulations and 10,000 words in the biblical Book of Revelations.

“Surely we can tell barbers how many combs to have in less words than it takes to describe
Armageddon,” she said.

Brunner and Greitens are running as outsiders who will force government to work like a business.
Brunner had a more practical application of his outsider status to offer.

“As CEO of Missouri to other CEOs, I can attract other businesses back to this state,” Brunner said.
Greitens, meanwhile, is running as hard against the power structure in Jefferson City as some presidential candidates run against Washington, D.C.

“Politicians have failed us and we can’t trust them to fix the mess that they have created,” Greitens said.

COLUMBIA — Missouri Republican gubernatorial candidates spent much of a 90-minute debate Thursday night vilifying candidate Eric Greitens, who said he plans to keep a $1 million campaign contribution from a man recently accused of sexual abuse.

Criticism began early in the debate, which was hosted at Missouri Theatre. Greitens' three opponents, John Brunner, Catherine Hanaway and Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder assailed him for keeping the money.

"This election's going to come down to, 'Who do you trust?" Hanaway said. "There's one candidate on this stage who's talked repeatedly about rooting out corruption, and yet his biggest donor ... was alleged to have sexually abused a woman.'"

The donation came from Michael Goguen, a California tech financier. Last week, a woman sued Goguen and accused him of sexually assaulting her for more than a decade, according to the Associated Press. The woman said Goguen promised to pay her $40 million in compensation for the abuse but only gave her $10 million.

"Unlike career politicians, I'm not going to convict someone in the court of public opinion," Greitens said in response. "I think this is what happens when desperate politicians get very desperate."
Greitens urged waiting for the results of the lawsuit before passing judgment and shot back, accusing Hanaway of wavering on support for concealed carry measures and bringing up that Kinder's admission that he spent time at an Illinois strip club in the 1990s.

But Hanaway denied any waffling and said Greitens' actions silence the voices of abused women.

"I don't want to walk away from his issue of an abused woman," she said. "Powerful men always try to suppress (women's) voices. You should allow this woman's voice to be heard."

After the debate, Brunner praised the actions of presidential candidate John Kasich, who said he would donate a contribution from Goguen to a charity dedicated to end human trafficking, according to The Associated Press.

Even after the candidates moved onto other questions, the squabble continued. Kinder brought up that Greitens used to be a Democrat.

"Who are these billionaires donating six and seven figures sums to try to buy the governor's mansion in Missouri for a guy who was a Democrat about 18 months ago?" he said.

The candidates also discussed legislative moves to restrict the University of Missouri System budget. Last week, the Missouri House voted to cut about $7.6 million from UM System administration and transfer an additional $1 million from MU to Lincoln University. In recent months, legislators have censured the university's handling of assistant communication professor Melissa Click. Click called for "some muscle" to remove a student journalist from campus protests following the resignation of former UM System President Tim Wolfe.

Administrators at MU and Democratic leaders in Jefferson City failed to handle racially charged campus protests in November, the candidates said.
"We have had a massive failure of leadership from the governor’s mansion on down," Kinder said. He criticized the November actions of Missouri football players, who said they would boycott football activities until Wolfe stepped down.

The candidates said they would appoint new curators to address the problems. Hanaway said any curators she appointed would be required to uphold three principles: "Teachers will teach, scholarship athletes will play, and students will be able to go to class without 'muscle' being called at," she said.

Hanaway said she would only consider restoring the cuts when university leaders become more responsive to legislative concerns, something Kinder echoed. Brunner said he would continue to support cuts as long as MU maintains a relationship with Planned Parenthood.

Greitens warned that budget cuts could provoke a vicious cycle of poor decisions. Any decision to cut money for faculty, he said, could lead to worse instruction for students.

Candidates spar during GOP governor debate

COLUMBIA - A debate between Republican candidates for governor grew contentious at times Thursday night.

Candidates strayed away from topics several times while answering questions on topics such as bringing jobs to Missouri, funding state roads, race relations, university funding, term limits and campaign reform.
Candidates included St. Louis businessman John Brunner, former Navy SEAL Eric Greitens, Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder and former Missouri Speaker of the House Catherine Hanaway.

When asked a viewer question about minimum wage, Hanaway quickly swerved to the topic of one of Greitens's campaign donors who was accused of sexual assault in Silicon Valley. She said Greitens should have to give that money to abuse shelters for women.

In response, Greitens said Hanaway's actions were "desperate." He said decisions should be made only when the facts of the case are determined. He then went on to question Hanaway's support for concealed carry.

"She was against concealed carry in 2002. She was against concealed carry in 1999," Greitens said. "Her record on protecting your Second Amendment rights was so bad that the NRA gave her a D - a rating lower than Chris Koster."

Hanaway said the NRA endorsed her as the "best choice" last time she ran for office, and she said the concealed carry law wouldn't have happened without her. She then returned to Greitens's donor case.

"Nice diversionary tactic, Eric," Hanaway said. "But I don't want to walk away from this issue of an abused woman that you won't take her word for it."

Later in the debate, when asked a viewer question about marijuana legalization, Kinder returned to the accusations of Greitens's donor.

Greitens responded by bringing up Kinder's previous involvement in a strip club scandal, and said Kinder had no room to discuss "tabloid" sexual accusations.

Here are the candidates' responses to other topics throughout the debate:

**Missouri jobs**

Candidates first discussed their plans for bringing high-paying jobs to Missouri. Although the unemployment rate was at its lowest since June, 2001, the state's poverty level was above 15 percent.

"We need strong leadership to take Missouri on a U-turn from the course we're on," Kinder said. "We are surrounded by tax-cutting states, and we need to get with the program."
Brunner highlighted his history with job creation in his response.

"As a CEO in Missouri to other CEO's, I gotta bring business back to this state," Brunner said.

Hanaway and Greitens instead said it's not up to the government to create jobs.

Hanaway said "hard-working Missourians" create jobs and government regulations were "crushing" small businesses. She also said Right-to-Work would benefit Missourian workers because it would increase wages and job positions faster.

Greitens added the government must create the conditions for job growth.

"We need to simplify the tax code and make it fair for people around Missouri," Greitens said.

**Missouri highways**

Another topic for debate was the state of Missouri's highway system. A 17-cent-per-gallon gas tax helps fund the transportation system, but it hasn't increased in 20 years.

Brunner said he didn't intend to increase taxes or tolls to help increase road funding, but he said Missouri roads are "so far behind," they need to be a top priority for lawmakers.

Hanaway said Missourians don't trust MoDOT to spend their tax dollars efficiently. She recommended a three-part plan for highway funding that would track spending. The measures would include MoDOT is spending the money efficiently, making sure dollars collected in the gas tax are spent on roads and bridges, and possibly shifting the taxing priorities and increasing the gas tax. Greitens said he wouldn't raise taxes for Missourians, but the solution to highway funds wasn't "magic."

"We have a major problem with roads and bridges here in Missouri," Greitens said. "This requires a leader who will change business as usual in Jefferson City."

Kinder said he was in favor of regional transportation districts in the state.

**Race relations**

Another area addressed by candidates was race relations in Missouri. The topic gained national attention after the events in both Ferguson and the November protests on the University of Missouri's campus.
Greitens said his history as a Navy SEAL and his support of law enforcement officers could've prevented some of the results of the Ferguson protests.

"I went out to Ferguson," Greitens said. "The great tragedy of Ferguson was having a leader who didn’t address it with calm and clarity...we could've had peace by the second night."

Kinder said the actions of Gov. Jay Nixon and Attorney General Chris Koster in Ferguson was “the worst betrayal of leadership” and a reason for failed race relations. He said unification starts with supporting law enforcement. Hanaway also questioned the governor's leadership.

"Nixon gave an open invitation for rioters from all over the country to come to Ferguson," Hanaway said. "Part of the problem is that he didn't have relations with that community."

Brunner said he didn't need to visit Ferguson to see what was happening.

"It’s been happening for 30 years," Brunner said. "Dealing with racism is about being engaged and caring."

Greitens, who had previously been silent on the University of Missouri protests, said the actions were a result of failed leadership.

He said what happened on campus was about a small number of people on campus saying "today, life on campus is too tough."

"If you’re concerned with social justice then go out a do something about it," Greitens said.

**UM System funding**

On a similar note, candidates discussed how they would address funding for the University of Missouri if elected as governor. Lawmakers have been considering a $7.6 million cut to the university's system.

Brunner said cuts would be justified. He said taxpayers want to see more students learning and less protesting.

Hanaway said it would be difficult to rebuild the state's flagship institution until leadership was accountable to donors and taxpayers. She said she would ensure that, "teachers will teach, scholarship athletes will play and students will attend class without 'muscle' being called in."

Hanaway previously said scholarship students or athletes shouldn't have the right to boycott their responsibilities if they disagree with campus policy. This was a contested topic in November when a number of the university's football players boycotted activities during the protests on campus.
Kinder said he would fight for the university's budget.

**Term limits**
The candidates also touched on term limits in the legislature. Some lawmakers had recently proposed the idea of adjusting the limits so legislators could serve longer for more continuity. The candidates all said they disagreed to a certain extent.

Kinder said he had supported term limits for Missouri government officials for decades, but he doesn't support implementing limits on officials who don't currently have them.

Hanaway and Greitens said they support term limits for all officials.

"Diapers and politicians should be changed frequently and for the same reason," Greitens said, quoting Mark Twain.

**Campaigning**
When addressed with the question of campaign reform and political gifts, Hanaway said she "absolutely supports" a ban on all gifts from lobbyists. She received $750,000 from a single donor in her campaign, but she said she was transparent about it. She said she wanted to expose what happens behind closed doors.

"Sunlight and transparency will clean the system," Hanaway said.

Greitens has received a large amount of his campaign funds from resources outside of Missouri. When asked how that plays into representing Missourians in his campaign, he said strong conservatives want to invest in a campaign like his, and he said he was able to make those connections within the state, as well.

Brunner was asked about his alignment with GOP presidential candidate Donald Trump. He said no matter how he answered, he would upset half the room.

Kinder has been criticized for hotel bills in the past. When asked about limiting the use of taxpayer money for travel expenses, he said he wrote the biggest personal check he had ever written, $53,000, to remove any taint from the scandal.
Missouri GOP governor candidates spar over donations from donor accused of sex abuse

Despite the efforts of moderators to stick to subjects such as tax policy and infrastructure, a debate between Missouri’s four Republican gubernatorial candidates Thursday night descended into arguments over sex abuse allegations, strip clubs and out-of-state money.

At issue was the roughly $1 million in donations that candidate Eric Greitens has accepted from a California investor who was sued last week by a woman who claims the investor sexually assaulted her for more than a decade.

During the debate at the University of Missouri-Columbia, candidate Catherine Hanaway broke out of a discussion about the minimum wage to allege that Greitens’ refusal to immediately return the contributions from the investor — as did GOP presidential candidate John Kasich — is an affront to women.

“An abused woman, (and) you won’t take her word for it,” Hanaway said. “Powerful men always try to suppress their voices.”

Greitens countered that Hanaway, a former prosecutor, is assuming the guilt of the contributor before the civil case plays out. “Unlike career politicians, I’m not going to convict someone in the court of public opinion,” Greitens said.

Later, Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder returned to the topic, telling Greitens: “Eric, I don’t think you’re going to be able to maintain this with your million-dollar donor ... John Kasich did the honorable thing within a few hours.”
Kinder then challenged Greitens — who has been criticized because a large portion of his campaign money comes from outside Missouri — to explain, “Who are these billionaires giving money to a guy who was a Democrat 18 months ago?”

Greitens responded with a reference to a 2011 controversy over Kinder’s earlier relationship with a stripper.

“Peter, you’re the last person on this stage, sir, who should be trafficking in tabloid stories about men hanging out in strip clubs,” Greitens said.

Kinder called that comment a “slimming,” and noted that despite that controversy, he has been re-elected to statewide office.

It was a diversion from an otherwise policy-heavy debate at MU’s Missouri Theatre, as Hanaway, Greitens, Kinder and businessman John Brunner agreed on the need for low taxes, looser regulations, “right-to-work” legislation and other standard Republican positions.

The campaign gift controversy first came up this week, when Hanaway demanded that Greitens return the $1 million his campaign has received from California venture capitalist Michael Goguen. The investor is the subject of a lawsuit filed last week alleging that Goguen “sexually, physically and emotionally” assaulted a woman for 13 years.

A super-PAC that supports Kasich’s presidential bid has already returned a $250,000 donation from Goguen. Greitens’ campaign has said it will wait for the litigation to play out before deciding whether to return the money.

Other than the digressions into the sex-and-money controversies, the candidates stuck to what have become familiar campaign themes.
Brunner stressed his credentials as a former CEO and argued that will help him build the state's economy. Hanaway stressed her experience as a prosecutor. Kinder noted he is the only candidate who has shown he can win a statewide election. Greitens stressed his background founding an organization to help fellow veterans continue to serve in their communities.

Missouri’s state primaries are Aug. 2. The winner of the Republican primary will most likely face Democratic Missouri Attorney General Chris Koster in the Nov. 8 general election.

**Greitens in hot seat as Missouri governor hopefuls debate**

COLUMBIA — Unlike in past Republican gubernatorial debates, the focus Thursday was not on roads, taxes or regulations, but rather on the controversial $1 million donation candidate Eric Greitens has received.

During the debate, Catherine Hanaway, one of four Republican candidates for governor of Missouri, renewed her call for Greitens to return or give to charity a $1 million donation he received from a Silicon Valley donor.

Greitens said he would keep the $1 million in campaign donations from the California venture capitalist accused of sexual abuse.

Hanaway wasn't alone.

"I don't think you'll be able to maintain this," Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder told Greitens during the debate.

Kinder noted in a post-debate press conference that Republican presidential candidate John Kasich's super PAC is giving a contribution from the same donor to charities that fight human trafficking.
Greitens quickly shot back at both Hanaway and Kinder during the debate.

"Unlike career politicians, I'm not going to try someone in the court of public opinion," Greitens said.

He also accused Hanaway, the former Missouri Speaker of the House and U.S. Attorney, of not supporting gun rights early in her political career and brought up a scandal involving Kinder and a stripper from 2011.

"I think, Peter, you're the last man on this stage who should be trafficking in stories about men hanging out in strip clubs," Greitens said.

The fourth Republican candidate, businessman John Brunner, didn't speak about the controversial donation during the debate. In a press conference after the debate, Brunner said he, too, thinks Greitens should return or give away the donation.

"While the court has yet to sort out all the facts, as Mr. Greitens has said, what we do know, or what Mr. Goguen has admitted, he's admitted that he's had a relationship with this woman for over 10 years spanning three of his marriages, he has admitted that she had to have surgery, he has admitted that he has paid her $10 million and had an agreement to pay her $40 million in hush money," Hanaway said.

During his post-debate remarks, Greitens was resolute that he would not give back the money.

"What is really important is if you are taking a stand on principle then you stand on principle. My stand as I demonstrated very clearly tonight is that unlike the career politicians, I am not going to convict someone in the court of public opinion. We are going to see what the facts are so we can make a decision and a judgement based on that," Greitens said.

In response to a question, Greitens said he did attend a fundraiser in California this week that was attended by Michael Goguen, who was sued in California last week by a woman alleging that he sexually abused her for more than a decade. Greitens said Goguen did not make a contribution at that event.

During the debate, both Brunner and Greitens billed themselves as political outsiders.

"I'm not looking to jump start or extend a political career," Brunner said.

Meanwhile, Kinder touted his political experience, saying he is the only Republican candidate to win three statewide elections. In responding to a question, Kinder said that Brunner and Greitens have displayed some political naivete on the "nuts and bolts" of state politics.

"I think they have some work to do. They are both friends of mine. We tend to get cliches and bromides and sayings from boxing coaches...Yes, I think we can probe deeper for better answers
form them, and I'm not sure they're demonstrating a knowledge of nuts and bolts of state government, Kinder said.

Kinder specifically took issue with Greitens' statement that all state tax credits are bad, noting some tax credits go to support single mothers and neighborhood revitalization programs.

On questions of the economy, the candidates held similar positions. All said they would support right-to-work legislation. They also said they would look to lower or simplify state taxes and reduce regulation on business.

Asked whether they were willing to increase taxes to improve the state's ailing roads and bridges, the candidates either said no or expressed a strong unwillingness to do so.

Hanaway said she would consider a sales tax to increase revenue for roads only if there was a corresponding decrease in income taxes. Brunner said he would find "efficiencies."

Greitens has said the way to solve the state's road funding issues is to overhaul its entire budgeting process, and he called for zero-based budgeting, which would require state departments to completely rework their budgets each year. Kinder didn't directly rule out a tax increase but said the next governor needed to earn Missourians' trust by showing he or she is fiscally responsible.

The debate was held inside the Missouri Theatre in Columbia. The debate was sponsored by the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, the University of Missouri and KMOU.

*The Associated Press contributed to this story*

**Republican candidates for Missouri Governor debate**


**COLUMBIA, Mo. -**
The four Republican candidates for Missouri Governor faced off Thursday night in a debate at the Missouri Theater.
The Republican candidates are suburban St. Louis businessman John Brunner, former Navy SEAL officer Eric Greitens, former U.S. attorney and state House speaker Catherine Hanaway and Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder.

One of the topics to come up was the unrest at the University of Missouri and funding to the UM system. All of the candidates spoke about the need for stronger leadership.

Candidates didn't agree on everything, though. Things got heated between Kinder and Greitens.

"He's an outsider to the conservative movement and the republican party in the state of Missouri," Kinder said.

Greitens responded to Kinder saying, "While you have been playing politics as a career politician, I was out on the field of battle happily defending our constitution that I took an oath to defend."

Missouri’s state-level primaries for both parties will be in august.

Rivals hit Greitens over donor facing abuse lawsuit

COLUMBIA, Mo — Republican Gubernatorial candidate Eric Greitens found himself under fire from his rivals Thursday over a donor who is accused of sexual abuse.
Silicon Valley investor **Michael Goguen is facing a lawsuit** from a woman who claims he abused her over the course of 13 years. Goguen allegedly told the woman he would free her from human traffickers if she had sex with him. According to the St. Louis Business Journal, Goguen has donated a total of $1 million to Greiten's gubernatorial campaign.

The donation became a point of contention during a Thursday night debate in Columbia. Greitens' opponents in the GOP primary urged him to follow the example of Ohio governor and presidential candidate John Kasich, who donated the money he received from Goguen to groups fighting human trafficking, according to Yahoo News.

Lt. Gov. Peter Kinder told reporters after the debate if Greitens was running his campaign on being a man of principle, he should return the money.

"I don't believe the people of Missouri are going to stand for a million-dollar donation from a man like this," he said.

Catherine Hanaway, a former federal prosecutor, said she has prosecuted sexual abuse and assault cases in which women struggled to make their voices heard.

"It's time for Mr. Greitens to renounce his prior statements, cut all ties and send the money back," she said. "Even better, he should send it to a shelter for abused women."
Greitens defended his decision to hold on to the money. He accused his rivals and the media of trying to convict Goguen in the court of public opinion before all of the facts are known.

"Unlike the career politicians, I'm not going to convict someone in the court of public opinion. We're going to see what the facts are so that we can make a decision and a judgment based on the facts," he said.

**U of Missouri Board Responds to AAUP on Click Case**

The University of Missouri Board of Curators on Thursday responded to the American Association of University Professors’ planned investigation of the Melissa Click case. Pamela Q. Henrickson, board chair, said in a 10-page letter to AAUP that the termination of Click, the former assistant professor of communication at the Columbia campus who asked for muscle to remove a student journalist and yelled at police during on-campus protests this fall, is fundamentally consistent with AAUP values. That’s despite AAUP’s contention that Click was terminated without an opportunity to appeal to a faculty body, a widely followed standard endorsed by the association.

Henrickson said that AAUP’s statements on such matters don’t establish an absolute right or requirement to such a hearing, and instead focus on matters of academic freedom and tenure. She denied that Click’s case concerns academic freedom or tenure, which she noted the professor did not have. Henrickson also wrote that while the board endorses faculty hearings in midterm dismissal cases, Click’s case was not typical in that existing university procedures failed to address the seriousness of her actions (no one filed a complaint against Click).

"[The board] addressed conduct by Dr. Click that was contrary to those basic expectations and at odds with principles of free expression that animate [AAUP policy]," the letter says. "Indeed, by calling for physical intimidation or violence against a
student, Dr. Click engaged in conduct that, if tolerated, would pose a risk to the safety of students and faculty and fundamentally endanger the university’s academic environment.”

Henrickson said the board’s actions do not merit censure by AAUP, in which the investigation could result, but that the body is nonetheless reviewing existing Missouri polices to ensure that it will not have to act on its own in instances of future faculty misconduct. Hans-Joerg Tiede, associate secretary of AAUP’s department of academic freedom, tenure and governance, said the association’s investigation will continue as planned, with the investigating committee possibly responding to the board’s concerns in its report.

UM board says Melissa Click firing was handled properly

By: Koran Addo

When representatives from a national faculty organization touch down in Columbia, Mo., next week to investigate whether Melissa Click’s firing was handled properly, they won’t get an audience with the University of Missouri Board of Curators.

In a 10-page letter made public on Thursday, board chairwoman Pamela Henrickson informed the American Association of University Professors that a meeting with the organization’s investigative committee “seems unnecessary.”

Among other things, the AAUP investigates instances of conflict between faculty and university leadership. In this case, the organization has questioned whether UM’s board acted improperly for firing Click in February without first giving the former assistant professor a hearing in front of other University of Missouri-Columbia faculty.

In the board’s response, Henrickson explained that Mizzou faculty had a chance to hold a hearing but did not.
“Ultimately, the decision to terminate a faculty member’s employment rests with a governing board,” she said.

Missouri curators defend educator's firing over protests
COLUMBIA, Mo. (AP) — The University of Missouri system's governing board is dismissing a national professors group's claims that an educator was unjustly fired over her run-ins with student journalists.

The curators rebuffed the American Association of University Professors' contention that assistant communications professor Melissa Click didn't get due process before the board fired her last month. The curators rejected her appeal Tuesday.

The Columbia campus educator's caught-on-video confrontations with police during October protests in Columbia and with two student journalists weeks later drew national attention.

She has insisted that her ouster was unfair and that normal, on-campus procedures weren't followed.

But the curators said Thursday it has ultimate authority to fire a faculty member and was compelled to in Click's case because "existing university procedures failed to address the seriousness of (her) conduct."
University of Missouri curators defend Melissa Click firing in letter to AAUP

By RUDI KELLER

Thursday, March 17, 2016 at 2:00 pm Comments (28)

Members of the University of Missouri Board of Curators will not meet with representatives of the American Association of University Professors when three investigators visit Columbia next week to review the dismissal of Assistant Professor Melissa Click.

In a 10-page letter to the association dated Thursday and signed by board Chairwoman Pam Henrickson, the board defended its decision to fire Click for her behavior at Concerned Student 1950 demonstrations during the 2015 Homecoming parade and Nov. 9 on Francis Quadrangle. The curators did not violate association standards, university rules or Click’s academic freedom, the board wrote.

“The Board’s action does not concern the content of Dr. Click’s teaching or research,” the letter says. “For that matter, its action does not concern any of Dr. Click’s views, positions, or choices to associate herself with any particular students or groups.”

The board voted 4-2 on Feb. 24 to fire Click, one month after putting her on paid suspension. She called the decision unfair and appealed her termination, but the curators denied the appeal during a closed meeting Monday.

Click was recorded Nov. 9 calling for “some muscle” and putting her hands on student videographer Mark Schierbecker’s camera at the demonstration campsite after the resignation of UM System President Tim Wolfe. On Oct. 10 during the Homecoming parade, Click yelled an obscenity at Columbia police officers clearing demonstrators from the roadway at University Avenue and Ninth Street.

The Nov. 9 recording unleashed criticism from journalists and demands from Republican lawmakers that university officials fire Click.
The association decided March 7 to send three faculty members from other institutions to Columbia to investigate whether Click was denied due process in violation of university rules or the association's principles on academic freedom and standards for faculty dismissal.

The investigators will be in Columbia next week, and their report will determine whether the association will consider a censure action against MU at its June meeting.

In a statement issued after the association voted to investigate, Click said the curators “bowed to conservative voices that seek to tarnish my stellar 12-year record at MU.”

The facts surrounding Click’s case are not in dispute, the curators wrote, and no meeting with the investigators is necessary. The letter was written to correct mistaken characterizations of the board’s actions, the curators wrote.

“The Board's action did not threaten academic freedom or tenure and does not warrant censure,” Henrickson wrote.

Curators respond to criticism about Click firing

COLUMBIA — The University of Missouri Board of Curators has responded in writing to the American Association of University Professors' criticism of the firing of Melissa Click, saying the board followed protocol and that the firing did not involve the issue of academic freedom.

Click was fired after her involvement with the protest movement known as 'Concerned Student 1950,' and her behavior at a rally on MU's Carnahan Quadrangle in which she physically confronted a
and her actions at the MU homecoming parade in which she got in to a verbal confrontation with Columbia police.

The AAUP said in a letter regarding her termination that Click did not receive an adjudicative hearing before an elected faculty body, and complained that Click's academic freedom was compromised.

In its response, the Board of Curators said "The matter involving Dr. Click did not concern her academic freedom," and said the principle of tenure was not undermined, noting that Click did not have tenure. The curators' response also said the ultimate decision to terminate a faculty member's employment lies with the governing board. The response asserts that in Click's case, "the board provided her with fairness and due process."

The curators said they hope that in the future, such matters will be handled by a faculty review and will not result in the board needing to act on its own.

**Curators release response to AAUP complaint about Click investigation**

AAUP announced its intention to investigate Melissa Click’s firing shortly following her termination.

*By Claire Mitzel*

*March 17, 2016*
The UM System Board of Curators released a response Thursday to the American Association of University Professors following AAUP's announcement of a formal investigation into assistant communication professor Melissa Click's firing.

In its response, authored by Board of Curators Chairwoman Pamela Henrickson, the board said it had been clear about the reasons why Click was fired and said they did not believe a meeting with the AAUP was necessary.

The AAUP announced on March 7 that it would be launching an investigation into Click's firing to see if MU's policies and the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure had been violated. Depending on the AAUP’s findings, MU could be added to its censure list, which warns faculty about universities breaking academic freedom and tenure policies.

In the board’s response, Henrickson wrote that Click’s academic freedom had not been violated and had not been a source of contention.

“The matter involving Dr. Click did not concern her academic freedom and the board’s action does not undermine the principle of tenure (which Dr. Click did not have),” Henrickson wrote.

Additionally, the AAUP said faculty should have had a role in Click’s termination decision.

“Normative practice among American institutions of higher education is that a faculty member with indefinite tenure — or a probationary faculty member within the term of appointment — may be dismissed only following demonstration of cause in an adjudicative hearing before a faculty body,” the AAUP said in their announcement of their investigation.

The board said that it found it necessary to conduct its own investigation into Click without faculty hearings.

“While the board endorses the normative practice of faculty hearings in cases of mid-term dismissal, it found it necessary to act on its own in this singular instance when existing university procedures failed to address the seriousness of Dr. Click’s conduct,” Henrickson wrote in the board’s response.
The board said it had the legal right to fire Click.

“Ultimately, the decision to terminate a faculty member’s employment rests with a governing board, as the 1958 statement recognizes,” the board’s response read. “In reaching its decision in Dr. Click’s case, the board provided her with fairness and due process.”

The response to the AUUP included a list of what the board called “undisputed facts” about Click’s conduct in the fall such as attempting to block police officers during the October Homecoming parade and calling for “muscle” to remove student journalist Mark Schierbecker. The board also referenced university and AAUP standards that had been applied to Click’s case.

The board said the steps taken to fire Click were “well known and consistent with fairness and due process,” reviewing relevant information pertaining to Click, interviewing her and other witnesses and taking into consideration Click’s appeal of her termination, which the board rejected.

Is Graduate School Worth it?

Think about employment and salary prospects to calculate the return on investment from grad school.

By Linda Marsa

Since Kristofferson Culmer had no plans to teach, he hadn’t considered pursuing a Ph.D. in computer science.

But that quickly changed once he started a master’s program at the University of Missouri and realized that a doctorate is now a good way for job candidates outside the ivory tower to demonstrate the inventiveness and ability to solve complex technical problems that employers prize.
"It opens doors that wouldn't be there with just a master's degree," says Culmer, who intends to work in industry.

His decision should pay off. The tech business pays a premium for people in computer science, with median salaries of about $108,000 in a field projected to grow by 11 percent in the decade ending in 2024.

Still, Culmer, 38, has turned frugality into an art form. Even though his tuition is covered and an assistantship pays him $12,000 a year, "it's not enough to live on," he says. He supplements his income with summer jobs and has learned to live with less to avoid the perils many graduates face when freighted down by debt.

The type of return-on-investment calculations Culmer made, which take into account the prospects for finding work and career satisfaction as well as the financial picture, are a key exercise for anyone pondering grad school. Advanced degrees in fields outside of medicine, law and academia may not mean an instant salary bump or career advancement.

On average, people with a bachelor's and at least three years in the workforce out-earn those freshly out of grad school, according to a report released last year by Georgetown University's Center on Education and the Workforce.

Moreover, the average graduate student now finishes up owing $57,600 – including undergrad loans – and that figure can easily hit $100,000 or more.

The good news is that in many fields, people with the extra degree generally do catch up eventually. And people with advanced degrees enjoy lower rates of unemployment. What's more, jobs that require a master's or doctoral degree are experiencing high growth, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, with anticipated increases of 18 percent and 16 percent respectively this decade.

Employers, notes Andrew R. Hanson, a senior analyst at the Georgetown center, are thus looking for highly educated candidates. That includes people with Ph.D.s, who face a shortage of tenure-track positions and are increasingly stepping out of the ivory tower.

Stanford University, which tracks doctoral alumni, has found that nearly half have parlayed their intellectual depth and critical thinking skills into jobs in business, government or nonprofits, including at places like Intel, Microsoft, Goldman Sachs and the International Monetary Fund.

Keep in mind as you weigh your options that despite the rosy-sounding averages, employment and salary prospects vary considerably by discipline. An earlier Georgetown study found that people with an extra diploma and some experience in engineering and business, for example, can command starting salaries in the very high five-figure range. But the added degree has a negligible impact on lifetime earnings for writers, editors and even computer programmers.

[See photos of the 20 top-ranked business schools.]

Here are some other factors to consider as you plot your path.
1. The purpose of getting that extra degree: Grad school shouldn't be automatically assumed to be a resume enhancer, and the cost is too great to use it as a way to mark time until the job picture improves.

Make sure an extra degree is required or desirable in your chosen field. If your ultimate goal is a leadership or administrative post, says Suzanne Ortega, president of the Council of Graduate Schools, "an advanced degree may be required."

2. Your various program options: There's been a groundswell of innovation lately as programs try to do a better job of prepping students for the real world. So it pays to look around carefully.

Many programs are adding a big dose of training in technology and big data, for instance. And "professional" master's degree programs have been spreading that combine academics with job-specific training and the hands-on experience needed in the workplace.

There's more of a focus, too, on building networks that can later be tapped when prospecting for jobs. At Michigan State University, for instance, a formal program provides mentoring, workshops and overall guidance to doctoral candidates on cultivating skills that are transferable to the business world as well as academia.

Analysis: Primaries reveal political divides in Missouri

By DAVID A. LIEB The Associated Press

Thursday, March 17, 2016 at 2:00 pm

JEFFERSON CITY (AP) — Missouri is historically a politically divided state, splitting closely between Democrats and Republicans. This week's presidential primaries revealed those divisions also run deeply within each party.

Democrat Hillary Clinton and Republican Donald Trump each led their challengers by a mere two-tenths of a percentage point Wednesday after all the precincts had reported results. The two primaries were the closest ones yet in the national presidential campaign and too tight for The Associated Press to declare a winner.
Missouri voters divided between perceived establishment and outsider candidates in each party. They split ideologically over whether to back candidates on their parties’ conservative or liberal wings. And they separated demographically in their preferences, sometimes by age, race, gender and education.

“We have an interesting mix, and I think those dynamics make for the interesting political gumbo that is Missouri politics,” state Democratic Party Chairman Roy Temple said Wednesday. Whenever “both sides are well-funded and you have two really strong candidates, statewide elections in Missouri are very, very close.”

That’s something about which Democrats and Republicans can agree.

“I think as it reflects the deep divisions that exist in the country, you saw that in Missouri perhaps more starkly than any place else thus far in the nominating process,” said Missouri Republican Party Chairman John Hancock.

The Republican primary offered a choice among a pair of candidates embraced by some in the GOP establishment — Florida Sen. Marco Rubio and Ohio Gov. John Kasich — and two others often at odds with party leaders. Texas Sen. Ted Cruz appealed to the party’s most conservative factions. Trump appealed to those wanting “somebody that was completely outside the Republican establishment,” Hancock said. Trump and Cruz together split more than 80 percent of the Republican votes.

About half of Republican voters said they preferred an outsider rather than someone with experience in politics — and of those voters, two-thirds favored Trump and one-quarter went for Cruz, according to exit polls conducted for The AP and television networks by Edison Research.

In the Democratic primary, Clinton was more closely tied to the party establishment, enjoying the backing of most of Missouri’s top Democratic officials. Sanders was more often supported by those looking for change or a more liberal social agenda. In exit polls, Sanders received support from about two-thirds of voters who said they wanted someone who cares about them. Clinton received 9 in 10 votes among those who valued experience the most.

In well more than a dozen counties — covering parts of the Kansas City suburbs, Columbia, Jefferson City, Joplin, Springfield and Cape Girardeau — a plurality of primary voters opted for Cruz and Sanders, two candidates who would appear to be ideological opposites. But that’s not necessarily inconsistent.
“It tells you that there is something of an anger — a dissatisfaction — in the public this election cycle,” said Marvin Overby, a political science professor at the University of Missouri-Columbia. “People don’t always know how to direct that dissatisfaction and that anger, they're just looking for someone who is an alternative.”

Political analysts said Trump’s presence in the Republican primary makes it a little harder to dissect the reasons for the political divisions. That’s because Trump was a national figure — an outspoken businessman and TV reality show host — before he became a blunt-spoken candidate who has consistently defied conventional political expectations.

“Trump is so unusual — in every way that you want to define that,” said Jeremy Walling, an associate political science professor at Southeast Missouri State University.

But Walling believes there might be some commonality in the close Democratic and Republican primaries.

“Maybe what we see in this election is just everybody being fed up with the status quo — however they define what that thing is,” he said.

**UM System to hire auditing company to examine diversity**

REBECCA SMITH, 8 hrs ago

COLUMBIA — At a presentation Thursday, David Mitchell, chair of the UM System's diversity, equity and inclusion task force and associate dean of the MU School of Law, discussed the group's goals and the system's plan to hire an outside auditing company.

The audit is not meant to examine if the system is effective, Mitchell said, but to examine diversity, equity and inclusion within the system, which has never been done before.

The system is looking for auditing companies with a broad range of expertise in areas such as social science and law.
The task force, on the other hand, will be conducting its own "thorough, wide-ranging and unflinching study of the programs, policies and practices regarding diversity, equity and inclusion that have been institutionalized at the system," according to the system's website.

Doing that starts with understanding the structure and role that the UM System plays, Mitchell said.

In short: The UM System is an umbrella group that handles things such as budgeting, legal services, lobbying efforts and cooperation among the four universities, MU Extension and MU Health Care.

The system currently has six departments and the diversity task force make up a new, seventh department, he said.

The task force comprises two parts: one part includes existing system employees who will look at the data from the auditing company; the other will be composed of students, staff and faculty who will serve as liaisons between the system's task force and groups on individual campuses, Mitchell said.

Mitchell also emphasized that the task force will be examining all four campuses, MU Extension and MU Health Care, not just the UM System office and MU.

"(The four campuses) are each at four distinct areas of the state," he said. "They have different demographic locations that they serve, both in terms of students who are present on their campuses as well as the local communities."

"Every person on that task force will have an equal voice to examine, explore and investigate the data and make recommendations for change," Mitchell said.
Boone County puts events center up for lease, seeks innovative fairgrounds tenants

WILLIAM SCHMITT, 12 hrs ago

COLUMBIA — Boone County is looking for tenants to lease, manage and invest in the Central Missouri Events Center and consider bringing back the Boone County Fair.

The county's Purchasing Department issued Wednesday a request for short-term lease proposals of up to three years with the possibility of year-by-year renewal.

Northern District Commissioner Janet Thompson said multiple requests might be accepted, splitting up the property among multiple lessees. This would allow property managers to separate sections of the events center for different purposes simultaneously, a potential key to the property's future.

"We need to stop thinking of it as a fairgrounds," Thompson said. "Because when you think about it as a fairgrounds, you have tunnel vision as to what it could be. ... It's 129 acres that can serve many masters."

It has been estimated that the costs of repair projects such as fixing the Coliseum's leaky roof and replacing the HVAC system would cost more than $1 million. Thompson said that the possibility of starting from scratch needed to be considered.

"I think how we've laid it out and how we've conceived it really limits its use," Thompson said. "And that's why I just despise calling it a fairgrounds."
Looking for a lease

The county requested that those making offers propose a wealth of finance-related information. Offerors were asked that their proposals include:

- How the property would be used.
- How much a security deposit would be.
- Which buildings and property would be leased.
- The annual rate they would be willing to pay for each building.
- Levels of annual maintenance and capital investment.
- A timeline for when the lease would start.

The county also set some "special conditions that will govern the lease of the property" for consideration including:

- Occasional free use of the Coliseum and grounds for Boone County Sheriff’s Department training activities.
- Considering the Coliseum and fairgrounds for the Boone County Fair for two weeks in July and August each year of the lease, starting in 2017.
- The buildings will be leased "as is" and should be restored to "clean, usable conditions" at the end of the lease.
- "No subleases shall be granted for any adult-oriented businesses or conventions."

Responses are due at 5 p.m. on April 22. There will be a pre-proposal meeting at 2 p.m. March 29 at the events center, 5212 N. Oakland Gravel Road.

Among the 27 vendors signed up to receive notice that the request for proposals was published were Jeff Cook, president of the Boone County Fair Board, and Kent Sapp, who previously applied to manage the events center.
Purchasing Director Melinda Bobbitt said a brainstorming session with county leaders led to notice being sent to the city's Parks and Recreation Department and its Convention and Visitors Bureau; representatives of MU and other area colleges; Joe Bechtold, the Midway Truck Stop and Travel Plaza; Arlin Epperson, who previously applied to manage the events center; the National Equestrian Center in Lake St. Louis, Missouri; and Veterans United Home Loans.

Veterans United has held its holiday party at the events center since 2012, spokeswoman Lauren Karr said in an email, and its event in December drew over 2,600 people.

"The Events Center has proven a great place for us in the past, and we would love to see it available in the future," Karr said. "... If an RFP comes out, we would love to take a look at it. Bottom line, our focus is keeping our 2016 holiday event in Boone County."

**Backstory**

Presiding Commissioner Dan Atwill put together a task force of wealthy and prominent county residents to come up with ideas for how the property might be funded and put to use. At its Feb. 19 meeting, Central Missouri Events Center Review Committee members agreed that their top priority should be finding a way to reopen and run the fairgrounds in the short term.

An informational packet distributed at that meeting listed six options for how the property might be paid for, including partnering with the city, working with MU or selling the property. The county hasn't appraised the fairgrounds since it purchased the land for $2.4 million in 1999; a sale is the last item listed, noting that unofficial estimates place the price of the land at less than $3 million.

The land was managed from 2011 to June 2014 by TAG Events. One consistent challenge the fairgrounds poses is the lack of a dedicated revenue stream. In August 2014, county voters rejected by a 2-1 margin a one-eighth-cent sales tax that was expected to generate $2 million to $3 million annually to go toward events center operations.

The 2016 Boone County Fair will be held in Sturgeon, which has the 15-acre Lawrence Memorial Fairgrounds Park. The fair is scheduled to run from July 19-23.
Beyond Sombreros, Tequila, and ‘Gangster’ Parties

A couple of months after Ryan Wilson arrived at Yale University, a friend asked if she could borrow his clothes for a theme party. The theme? "Gangsters."

Mr. Wilson, who is black, hadn’t yet found his voice as a campus activist, and that moment sticks with him clearly, even years later.

"She took my own clothes. That blew my mind," Mr. Wilson said in an interview. "When they dress up as gangsters, they dress up as black youth. It just went to show when they thought of gangsters, that was the image that was in their head."

It may have been the first time, but it was far from the last, that Mr. Wilson would encounter cultural appropriation firsthand on the campus.

Of course, Yale and Mr. Wilson aren’t unique. Campuses across the country frequently wrestle with instances of cultural appropriation, or the act of adopting elements of another culture. Meanwhile, social media can instantly send a local controversy viral, bringing the looming threat of a national backlash over political correctness run amok.

Recent examples abound, such as the so-called tequila party at Bowdoin College that gained attention in a Washington Post opinion piece or last year’s cafeteria protests at Oberlin College, which are still cited by national outlets. When students there claimed the Americanized version of Asian cuisine was cultural appropriation, online
observers used it as yet another piece of evidence that today’s students are coddled or oversensitive.

Colleges, which want to promote a welcoming environment while also avoiding disciplinary overreach, are in a bind. Can they really turn those incidents and all the accompanying hype into learning opportunities?

**A Controversial Email**

Two years after the initial incident at Yale, Mr. Wilson, now a leader of student activism on the Ivy League campus, was presented with a chance to stand up to cultural appropriation.

Last October the university’s intercultural-affairs committee sent an email urging students to think about cultural appropriation as they chose costumes for Halloween. The email was a nice and necessary gesture as far as Mr. Wilson was concerned, but shortly after, a Yale lecturer, Erika Christakis, sent an email of her own to the students in the residence hall where she was associate master. She criticized the university for trying to tell the students what to wear and for attempting to squash their right to express themselves.

Mr. Wilson was shocked and angry, and he wasn’t going to stand by idly as he had done a couple of years before. He drafted an open letter to Ms. Christakis that called the contents of her email "jarring and disheartening." His letter garnered several hundred signatures from students, alumni, and staff members.

"I just didn’t see anything to object to in the initial email," he said. "I didn’t really think being asked to be a little more sensitive and actually engage with these problems was a ridiculous thing to ask college students."
Mr. Wilson, a junior who is studying ethnicity, race, and migration, was encouraged by the reaction to his letter. But, he said, much work remains.

"I definitely have had a lot of instances where I have been made to feel like an outsider here at Yale," he said. "There are a lot of moments where I have loved being at Yale, but there have also been a lot of moments where it doesn’t feel like Yale is completely dedicated to having someone like me on campus."

In the wake of the backlash against her, Ms. Christakis decided not to teach this spring. Last month she told *The New York Times* that the criticism she had received "was a painful experience."

In November the university’s president, Peter Salovey, responded broadly to campus activism. In a campuswide email, Mr. Salovey said he would make changes to "build a more inclusive Yale." Those changes included expanding the budget for the university’s four cultural centers and putting members of the administration through "training on recognizing and combating racism."

*The Next Mizzou or Yale’*

In the spring of 2013, back-to-back instances of cultural appropriation at California State University at San Marcos sparked a conversation. The campus ramped up training and conversations about cultural appropriation, but the constant turnover of students makes it hard to keep up, Margaret Chantung, a spokeswoman for the university, said.

When campuses fail to confront cultural appropriation, students then are forced to do it for them. Bridget Blanshan, associate vice president for student affairs on the San Marcos campus, said students should not have to educate their peers, unless that is a role they embrace.
While some instances of cultural appropriation happen out of ignorance, she said, others do not.

"I doubt that some things were unintentional," Ms. Blanshan said, adding that "students who don’t understand the full impact often are students who are not from that culture or they experience their heritage in a very different way."

A page on San Marcos’s website points out that incidents may not seem like a big deal at the time, but pictures on social media can have repercussions down the road.

"In today’s era of social media it is not difficult for future employers and graduate-school admissions officers to find online photos of these types of events," the page reads. "With today’s employers looking for employees who can work effectively in a diverse and global environment, and because of the costs of defending against discrimination claims, participation in such events will not be looked upon favorably."

Social media is often a hotbed for students discussing instances of appropriation, especially when they can do so anonymously. After a string of controversies at Middlebury College, including a Latino student who confronted another student in the dining hall for wearing a sombrero, conversation on the anonymous app Yik Yak took off, said Miguel Fernández, Middlebury’s chief diversity officer, just as happened during student protests last fall at the University of Missouri.

"Someone on Yik Yak said, ‘A year ago if I had worn a sombrero nobody would have said anything,’” Mr. Fernández recalled, adding that it was clear there was confusion surrounding what cultural appropriation is and what it meant.

**Mr. Fernández said he sought immediate action because he feared that Middlebury could be "one case away from being the next Mizzou or Yale."**
He decided to lead a trio of town-hall meetings on the Vermont campus. The first two were so popular that people were turned away, and the third was held in a larger space, he said, noting the event’s dialogue was emotional but productive.

Yet Elizabeth Dunn, a sophomore who attended all three town halls, said the people who really needed to be there, weren’t.

Ms. Dunn wrote of her frustrations about cultural appropriation in an opinion piece for the campus newspaper, which included her concerns that the rapper Felly was slated to perform on the campus. She wrote that the white rapper "is the epitome of cultural appropriation and white privilege."

While Ms. Dunn said she is pleased that leaders like Mr. Fernández are spearheading conversations, she need not look further than the cruel comments left on her article for a reminder of how little has actually changed.

One commenter said, "Just lost a little more faith in humanity after reading this," while another wrote, "This is absolutely ridiculous. Wow."

Ms. Dunn said the veil of anonymity the Internet readily supplies is what concerns her the most. While she, and most everyone else, knows cultural appropriation is never going to be eliminated from campuses, she thinks the best bet to reduce cases of it is for students to be willing to engage with and listen to one another.