COLUMBIA, Mo. (AP) _ The University of Missouri is fighting a former assistant professor’s effort to collect unemployment benefits after she was fired for conduct during campus protests.

Melissa Click, an assistant professor, was fired in February after a videotaped confrontation of her calling for “some muscle” to remove a student videographer from a protest area in November.

The Columbia Daily Tribune reports (http://j.mp/28U1IQJ ) University of Missouri system spokesman John Fougere said in an email the university is fighting Click’s unemployment claim “because according to state statute, an employee is not entitled to unemployment benefits when discharged for misconduct.”

A hearing was held Wednesday in Jefferson City by a referee who takes evidence in appeals after a decision is made on a benefits application. Click’s lawyer at the hearing couldn’t be reached for comment.
Melissa Click appeals denial of unemployment benefits for firing by University of Missouri

By RUDI KELLER

Saturday, June 25, 2016 at 12:00 am

The University of Missouri is fighting former Assistant Professor Melissa Click's effort to collect unemployment benefits after the Board of Curators fired her in February for her conduct during November protests on campus.

A hearing was held Wednesday in Jefferson City by a referee who takes evidence in appeals filed by employers and employees after a decision is made on an initial application for benefits. The university in February hired attorney Chuck Hatfield of Stinson Leonard Street LLP "for advice and representation regarding separation of employment of Melissa Click, including claims asserted by Ms. Click and related legal proceedings," according to an engagement letter from the firm.

Hatfield is being paid $530 an hour for his services, and paralegal work at the firm is being billed at $295 per hour. Hatfield declined to comment on the hearing, citing attorney-client privilege and state law requiring information in the case to be kept confidential.

Lauren Schad, spokeswoman for the Missouri Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, declined to release any information about the hearing, citing the same law.

The university is fighting Click's unemployment claim "because according to state statute, an employee is not entitled to unemployment benefits when discharged for misconduct," UM System spokesman John Fougere wrote in an email.

The Board of Curators fired Click on Feb. 24 after months of controversy surrounding her actions on Nov. 9, when she tried to enforce a boundary intended to keep media out of the Concerned Student 1950 protest campsite on Carnahan Quadrangle. Click was recorded trying to organize an effort to
push out photographer Tim Tai and grabbing at a camera held by Mark Schierbecker, who posted the video on YouTube.

The video generated harsh reaction from First Amendment advocates and conservative Republican lawmakers, who called for Click’s dismissal. She apologized the day after the incidents, but Schierbecker persisted in seeking a criminal charge for assault, filed Jan. 25.

The charge, filed in municipal court, was not prosecuted after Click agreed to terms that included community service. The board voted 4-2 to fire Click and, after she appealed the decision, affirmed it in March.

Click was an assistant professor of communication who was being considered for tenure at the time she was fired. Her salary at the university was $57,798 per year.

Under Missouri law, people eligible for unemployment are able to receive a maximum of $320 per week for 13 weeks while they seek work. Unemployment can be denied for voluntarily leaving a job or for work-related misconduct.

If a claim is denied, an appeal can be filed, and a referee is appointed to resolve the case. The decision can be further appealed to the Missouri Labor and Industrial Relations Commission and the Missouri Courts of Appeals.

Click was represented Wednesday by Jessica Scales, an attorney with Sedey Harper Westhoff of St. Louis. Scales could not be reached for comment.
Calling it “a celebration of higher education,” State Sen. David Pearce, R-Warrensburg, on Friday gathered a group of educators and other at the University of Missouri to praise Senate Bill 997.

“It’s going to make differences in peoples’ lives,” said Pearce, who sponsored the bill. Gov. Jay Nixon signed the bill into law last week. The legislation was based on the Missouri Department of Higher Education’s “Blueprint for Higher Education.”

“It’s so important when students start their academic career they finish,” Pearce said. “And finish on time.”

The gathering was held at the Reynolds Alumni Center on the MU campus. Pearce is term-limited and isn’t seeking higher office. He called the bill a “home run.”

The law encourages students to complete at least 15 credit hours per semester and offers possible financial incentives. It also spurs students to take dual-credit classes to earn college credit while in high school. High school students who are eligible for free or reduced-price meals would be eligible for scholarships of up to $500 per year for the classes.

“What it speaks to is helping the neediest students” get college credit in high school, Pearce said.

Crowder College in Neosho and a few other community colleges around the state allow students to earn associate’s degrees while in high school. Leroy Wade, interim commissioner of the Department of Higher Education, said the scholarship might help those programs expand.

“The number one reason students don’t finish Mizzou is financial,” said Jim Spain, vice provost for undergraduate studies at MU. He said helping students graduate in four years dramatically reduces their expenses.

Spain said MU has developed a transfer student initiative called Community College Pathways, allowing students to be enrolled in a community college concurrent to being a student at MU. The initiative will begin with a partnership with Moberly Area Community College.

The concurrent enrollment program is another part of the law.

Terry Barnes, assistant to the provost for undergraduate studies at MU, said many students opt to receive their first few years of higher education at a community college because of the lower cost.
“Any pathway to success will work,” Barnes said. “This bill has helped us to reaffirm our partnership with community colleges.”

Paula Glover, chief academic officer with Moberly Area Community College, said the concurrent enrollment would reduce instances of students saying their credits didn’t transfer, saving students both time and money.

“It allows those students to have the best that both institutions have to offer,” Glover said.

The law promises the creation of a student portal website to provide information to students and parents about financial aid, transferring college credit and other details. Wade said the website should be available next summer.

Under the law, the Missouri Department of Higher Education will provide guidelines for notifying public employees about a federal public service program to forgive student loans. Pearce said teachers could benefit, too.

The law also reauthorizes the Wartime Veterans Survivor grant program, which provides higher education financial assistance to spouses and children of military veterans whose deaths or injuries were the result of combat action since Sept. 11, 2001.

Brian Crouse, vice president of education for the Missouri Chamber of Commerce, said the law will help energize the state’s economy.

“It’s great to see when education can support that talent pipeline with acts like this,” Crouse said.

Acknowledging the legislative session was sometimes difficult for MU, Pearce said he and his colleagues in the General Assembly wanted to support a positive initiative.

“We’re all here because we realize how transformational higher education can be,” he said.

**MISSOURIAN**

**R. Bowen Loftin moves out and on to a new chapter**

TANZI PROPST, 1 hr ago
Since November, R. Bowen Loftin and his wife, Karin, have been able to spend more free time attending sporting events, seeing local orchestra performances and movies ... even going for walks together.

It has been a year of change for the Loftin household, including the house the couple occupied at MU.

On Nov. 9, Loftin announced he was stepping down as MU's chancellor. One of the conditions was that he leave the Chancellor’s Residence on Francis Quadrangle by the end of April. He remained on faculty, although his role wasn't clearly defined, according to previous Missourian reporting.

So many transitions.

He says his wife of 43 years has been a constant source of support through it all; she was there after all the doors had been closed and offered a sense of true understanding.

The Loftins began looking for a new home. The couple found it very difficult during the holiday season.

Their lives were slowly but surely boxed up, piece by piece, and stacked throughout the basement and in empty rooms around the Chancellor's Residence. Possessions were labeled "goes with Loftin" and "stays with the house" as Karin made her way through, organizing the couple’s things before the movers arrived to take care of the rest.

Fitting into what Loftin referred to as the "research broker" role at MU has been a comfort.
Travel remained constant during the transition, going to places such as Orlando and Los Angeles to network with research laboratories and creative technological institutes for on-campus research projects.

Many of the people Bowen Loftin has been meeting with are old friends — people he met while attending a conference when he used to do more research-based work.

Before the move, he usually began his day at the Missouri Athletic Training Center at 5 a.m. so as to not take any of the equipment from the student athletes. After the move, the former chancellor no longer had access to the facility, but there is a Wilson's Fitness just a few minutes down the road from his new home.

The relationships he has built with faculty and students throughout his time at MU have been a driving force in his involvement at campuswide activities such as sporting events and philanthropy gatherings.

R. Bowen Loftin had a tumultuous fall.

He faced criticism over his handling of graduate student health insurance even before the semester began. Nine deans signed a letter to the UM Board of Curators and the system president saying he had created "a toxic environment through threat, fear and intimidation." And throughout the semester, protests over systemic racism on campus continued to grow.

Loftin takes the long view.

"By and large people are pretty happy here," Loftin said. "Even those who aren't happy, I've tried to be very open to them, to listen to them and try to understand their point of view. And try to do what I could do to change their sense of how they feel about the university.

"Obviously imperfectly, but you do the best you can in the time you have."
University of Missouri students make crafts at art studio for care packages

By ALEC LEWIS

Sunday, June 26, 2016 at 12:00 am

University of Missouri students gathered Saturday at The Craft Studio to paint canvases and make cards to include in care packages the studio plans to send to Orlando after the June 12 Pulse nightclub shooting that claimed 49 lives.

Amy Hay, interim director of The Craft Studio, said MU sophomore Brooke Dearman inspired the event.

Dearman is from Aurora, Colo., the site of a July 20, 2012, shooting that killed 12 inside a movie theater. Dearman’s cousin, Veronica Moser-Sullivan, was killed in that shooting. At the time, the community befriended her family, which she said drove her to do the same for people affected by the events of Orlando.

Dearman said these positive events and actions are “always necessary in times like these.”
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The Supreme Court Frees Colleges to Sensibly Pursue Diversity

By Lorelle L. Espinosa and Peter McDonough JUNE 24, 2016

NO MU MENTION

In its second Fisher v. University of Texas at Austin decision (Fisher II) the Supreme Court on Thursday wisely reaffirmed the long-held legal principle that obtaining the educational benefits of a diverse student body is a compelling government interest. The court also signaled, during a
time of deep unrest and debate regarding diversity and inclusion on college campuses nationwide, something salient and undeniable: Race matters.

The affirmation that American colleges and universities can consider race as one factor in a holistic admissions review is a seemingly obvious and essential concept, especially now. But the long march to the Supreme Court’s recent ruling showed that accomplishing it can be remarkably challenging. Witness the University of Texas at Austin. Twice now in three years, the Supreme Court has wrestled with the nuances of that institution’s "Texas plan" for molding a diverse campus-learning environment.

That’s quite a story. The bigger story, though, is that there is a Texas plan, that it is different from the Harvard plan, and that both are different from diversity efforts across the broad landscape of higher education, including those in states that ban race-conscious admissions, such as California and Michigan. There is a difference in what a particular college, in a particular place, and at a particular moment, means by "diversity" and how an individual institution goes about encouraging and enabling it.

The American Council on Education and 37 other associations representing the entire spectrum of higher education emphasized in an amicus brief to the Supreme Court in *Fisher II* that institutional pluralism is a hallmark of American higher education. The brief stressed that "the constitutionally protected freedom to assemble a diverse student body would amount to little if it did not include the freedom to define the diversity sought" in accordance with each institution’s mission and concept of education.

We said that the interest in student diversity is compelling because it is grounded in educational benefits and rooted in educational judgment. Three times before, in *Bakke, Grutter,* and as recently as 2013 in its *Fisher I* ruling, the Supreme Court recognized that when a college sets its educational goals — including a goal of attaining the educational benefits of a diverse student body — it makes an autonomous educational judgment that merits judicial regard.

It has now said so once again. Thursday’s majority opinion gives due deference to an institution in defining "intangible characteristics, like student body diversity, that are central to its identity and educational mission," and also recognizes that the University of Texas has met its burden.

Of course, the *Fisher II* ruling does not give colleges unfettered discretion. The court reminded us — as laid out in *Fisher I* — that institutions must be able to demonstrate that the methods chosen to attain an institution’s own conception of diversity are narrowly tailored to that goal. They must define their goals "by reference to the educational benefits that diversity is designed to produce" (*Grutter*) and be able to articulate a "reasoned, principled explanation" (*Fisher I*) for their academic decisions.

In this regard, the Texas plan delivered. The majority opinion from Thursday’s ruling marches readers through the many steps and re-steps that the university took to arrive at its current practice of using the top-10-percent plan to admit roughly three-quarters of a freshman class in combination with an individualized or holistic review process for the remaining 25 percent of the students it admits. In the end, the court acknowledged that the university "articulated concrete and precise goals," and went through its required due diligence to ultimately conclude that "race-
neutral programs had not achieved the University’s diversity goals, a conclusion supported by significant statistical and anecdotal evidence."

It ought not to be surprising that an institution would consider and simultaneously implement strategies that are race-conscious and race-neutral. Research conducted by ACE at the time that the Supreme Court took up Fisher II makes clear that institutions that consider race in admissions decisions use other race-conscious and race-neutral diversity strategies more often and find them more effective than institutions that use race-neutral strategies alone. In short, striving for a racially diverse student body is not an "either/or" but a "both/and" proposition. As the majority of justices in fact acknowledged, the evidence put forth by the University of Texas clearly demonstrates that race-neutral approaches alone proved insufficient to meet its diversity goals; a finding widely supported by scholarly research.

If the decision had gone the other way and somehow barred the consideration of race, additional harms would ensue beyond the inability of institutions to exercise their best judgment in accordance with each of their missions and as they seek to enroll a diverse class. An insistence on the sole use of race-neutral approaches risks something more: stifling a much-needed conversation about diversity generally — and race in particular — on our country’s campuses, with an accompanying potential to worsen inequities. We need only look to events of the past many months where students nationwide have demanded not only an increase in the number of minority students on campuses, but also recognition of injustices and increased attention to the experiences of students of color. Moreover, institutions are responding. ACE’s survey of more than 550 college presidents released in March shows that since 2013, campuses have made racial climate a priority and are taking substantive, systemic action by way of increased support for diversity initiatives, student support services, cultural competency training, and public acknowledgment of a range of issues related to racial climate on campus. In this decision, the Supreme Court continued to enable these efforts in ways both legal and symbolic.

Now it is up to institutions to continue to do their part, and for the judiciary, legislators, and governors to continue to give them the latitude to go about their business. Colleges cannot claim to provide an excellent education if they send students into the world wearing blinders. Interaction among students from diverse backgrounds exposes each to a broad array of vantage points from which to view his or her own values.

Fortunately for the pursuit of diversity and for the educational benefits that flow from a diverse campus environment, the highest court in the land has made it clear that the ultimate educational judgment as how best to construct a diverse campus remains the purview of individual colleges and universities.

And yes, this is not a free pass. Nor should it be. It also is up to colleges that include race and ethnicity as one factor in admissions decisions to monitor their policies and practices to ensure they meet the high court’s test. That’s not a bad thing. The Fisher II decision recognizes the reality that the formula for educational excellence is ever-changing and almost always affected by context.
The takeaway for colleges from this decision is clear: If you feel as an institution you have gone
about the pursuit of a diverse campus in a defensible, sensible way, and you believe in the value
of a diverse learning community, you should feel very good today about what you can
accomplish tomorrow.
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**Turmoil Raises Specter of Faculty Exodus From Public Colleges**

*By Lee Gardner* JUNE 19, 2016

**NO MU MENTION**

State budget crunches and political turmoil have set off rumblings about a mass faculty exodus
from public colleges in some states. High-profile defections stoke the rumors. But have
professors really fled in droves?

It appears they haven’t. But the threat of departures has led to plenty of maneuvering behind the
scenes, and to other consequences as well.

Many public colleges in Wisconsin, where legislators stripped tenure protection and $250
million in support, and in Illinois, where a state-budget impasse has left campuses in the lurch,
didn’t lose substantially more faculty members to other institutions than in previous years.

But even if most professors are staying put, many have considered leaving. Some have quietly
entered the job market, and others may soon follow. Meanwhile, universities elsewhere have
escalated efforts to lure top scholars away from besieged competitors.

Faculty turnover is a fact of academic life, but the forces squeezing public colleges in several
states make the jockeying for jobs a little more charged this time. Departures have further
dimmed already low morale, even at prestigious flagships. And with budgets trimmed to the
quick, especially at regional universities, the loss of professors who may not be replaced is felt
deeply.

Many colleges haven’t yet resolved all of their negotiations this academic year, but they’ve been
counting up the losses. The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign had lost 22 out of about
1,900 tenured or tenure-track professors as of January, compared with only about a dozen in each
of the previous two academic years to that point. The university did not respond to requests for
more-recent data.
At the University of Wisconsin at Madison, out of about 2,250 tenured or tenure-track faculty members, about 23 have left so far this academic year, a number comparable to those of past years, says Sarah C. Mangelsdorf, the provost.

The number of departures disguises a frenzy of recruiting and negotiating. Twenty-one professors at Urbana-Champaign have asked for counteroffers from the university through January of this academic year, compared with just 11 in the same span last year. At Madison, requests for counteroffers nearly tripled, from 37 during the 2014-15 academic year to 94 in 2015-16 to date.

That comes with costs. With several cases still pending, the Madison flagship has managed so far to retain 76 of 88 professors who asked for counteroffers. That’s a retention rate of 86 percent, which nearly matches last year’s.

The university, aware that other institutions would entice its professors, budgeted funds to beat back the competition. Madison, even as it economized elsewhere, spent nearly $16 million this academic year on salary increases and additional research support to help keep faculty members who had offers in hand, Ms. Mangelsdorf says.

The prospect of departures also has less-tangible costs. In addition to the challenges of weakened tenure, eroded shared governance, and budget cuts at Madison, all the discussion about who’s staying, who’s leaving, and why has led to "an incredible amount of noise," says Nan Enstad, a professor of history. "It’s been a demoralizing year."

‘Quit Lit’

Most departing faculty members leave quietly, but some make their dissatisfaction public. Caroline Levine, who is stepping down as chair of the English department and leaving Madison, wrote an op-ed essay about her decision, taking the state government to task. Political rhetoric in Wisconsin often depicts professors as pampered fat cats who suck up tax dollars and offer little value. Ms. Levine had had enough. "We were told that we were wasting the public’s money while we’re working like crazy to do our jobs as well as we can," she says. "That’s the part that made it easy to go."

Sara Goldrick-Rab, who was a professor of education-policy studies and sociology at Madison, announced last summer that, because of weakened tenure protection, she would be looking for a new job. In March she declared in a blog post that she was leaving Wisconsin. She described how the state’s new "fake tenure" policies had led to her departure.

"I needed to lay it out there, for the people who aren’t my friends, who don’t already know," says Ms. Goldrick-Rab. "I had to say what had to be said." As she sees it, the University of Wisconsin at Madison "only learns when you call it out."

"Quit lit" is nothing new in higher education, says Nicholas C. Burbules, a professor of education policy, organization, and leadership at Urbana-Champaign. But typically it’s about leaving academe itself, not a particular university. The decision to depart one college for another is often
shaped not only by a professor’s attitude toward the institution, but also by pay, benefits, opportunities for career advancement, and the effect on family life.

Statements like Ms. Levine’s and Ms. Goldrick-Rab’s make a move an apparent act of social and political protest, and not just that "the grass is greener somewhere else," says Mr. Burbules. Both Ms. Levine and Ms. Goldrick-Rab say their decisions were not based on money. But each is making significantly more at Cornell University and Temple University, respectively.

In some cases, political turmoil or fiscal instability may be only a final push out the door. Arthur Kramer, director of Urbana-Champaign’s Beckman Institute for Advanced Science and Technology, is leaving his alma mater after more than 30 years to take a position at Northeastern University. So is his wife, Laurie F. Kramer, an associate dean for academic programs in the College of Agricultural, Consumer, and Environmental Sciences.

The move offers a great professional opportunity, Mr. Kramer says, and a chance for the couple to be near their daughter, in Boston. While the budget impasse in Illinois didn’t drive their decision to leave, he explains, "I can’t say that it wasn’t a factor."

Universities are always working, subtly and less so, to lure academic stars away from one another, but the climates in Wisconsin and Illinois rang the dinner bell for other institutions. Ms. Mangelsdorf, the Madison provost, says she heard as much from colleagues elsewhere. "They would jokingly tell me, ‘We’ve been given the green light to go after faculty from Wisconsin.’ " But they weren’t kidding.

More than just poaching individual scholars, some colleges planned ambitious raids. A fellow Big 10 university tried to hire three of the 30 faculty members in the department of education policy, organization, and leadership at Urbana-Champaign, says Mr. Burbules. So far none of them has resigned.

Looming Threat

Faculty members at Madison have debated staying and fighting rather than leaving, says Ms. Enstad, the history professor. The overwhelming majority has stayed put for now. "One percent is not exactly an exodus," says David T. Canon, a professor of political science.

But departures may continue in the year to come. Wisconsin’s Board of Regents didn’t approve the controversial new tenure policy until March, which left some despairing faculty members little time to enter the 2015-16 academic job market. "The retention issue, in terms of outside offers, is going to be much bigger next year than it is this year," says Ms. Goldrick-Rab. "It’s giving people more time to get their ducks in a row."

The university will continue to retain faculty members as aggressively as it can, says Ms. Mangelsdorf, but that doesn’t mean everyone. "You will never have a 100-percent retention record," she says, "nor would you want one." The loss of faculty members sometimes offers opportunities to hire new stars. Madison recently announced that it had hired Phillip A. Newmark, a developmental biologist and Howard Hughes Medical Institute investigator, away from Urbana-Champaign.
But after years of diminishing state support — or, in the case of Illinois, none for most of the past year — many tenure-track professors who leave aren’t replaced. The issue is especially acute beyond the public flagships, which typically have more-robust fund-raising and research budgets.

"It’s just disastrous at this point," says Andrea Imre, an electronic-resources librarian and a recent president of the Faculty Senate at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. The university has not seen a spike in departures this year, according to a spokeswoman. When professors do leave, their positions are sometimes filled by contingent faculty members, Ms. Imre says, but frequently are not filled at all.

The slow bleeding of the tenured faculty has been going on for years now, says Rachel I. Buff, a professor of history at the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee. In her 12 years there, the number of full-timers in her department has dwindled from 35 to about 29, she says, a "skeleton crew" that has trouble covering certain geographical and chronological gaps in the curriculum.

Ms. Buff knows of about 10 professors leaving Milwaukee. They’re not "players," looking to clamber up the career ladder, she says. "These are people who built lives and really invested." When they leave, they take with them not only their scholarship but also years of institutional memory and the ability to get things done at the university.

Few of her colleagues who left were eager to do so, Ms. Buff says, and neither is she. Her husband teaches at the university. Her daughter goes to a local school. "I can’t build a life like this again," she says. "I’m going down with the ship."

*Correction (6/21/2016, 5 p.m.):* This article originally reported that the department of education policy, organization, and leadership at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign has 42 faculty members. In fact, it has 30. The article has been updated accordingly.