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HIIT is great, but every workout has its time and place.

With the fitness world drowning in a sea of praise for high-intensity interval training, it’s hard to remember that other workout methods exist. HIIT has turned out to be pretty ideal for burning maximum calories in minimal time. And once you learn the quickest, most efficient way to get something done, it’s hard to look back. We get it. But focusing only on short, intense workouts and ignoring longer, lower-intensity ones may actually be sabotaging your goals—whether they’re centered on weight loss or strictly focused on athletic performance.

**Lower-intensity exercise that you can do for a longer period of time is called “steady-state cardio.”** It’s a type of aerobic exercise. “Steady-state aerobic exercise refers to an exercise intensity that results in a relatively stable heart rate and oxygen consumption,” Steve Ball, Ph.D., associate professor of nutrition and exercise physiology at the University of Missouri, tells SELF. “In simple terms, it is ‘slow long distance,’ and for years has been the formula for weight loss because it can be performed indefinitely and almost every day,” he explains.

The best example of this is a 60-minute jog—no hills or sprints, just chugging along at the same pace for an hour.

The key during steady-state cardio is to get your heart rate to a moderate level. “That means under 145 (beats per minute), and ideally around 135 or 140,” for most people, Andrew Kalley, founder of Kalley Fitness and NYC-based triathlon coach and personal trainer, tells SELF. Based on your rate of perceived exertion, your efforts should fall at about a 6 on a scale of 1 to 10 during steady-state workouts.
Steady-state cardio has its place in a well-rounded workout routine, but it has its downfalls, too. Here’s what you need to know.

**Most importantly, steady-state cardio is a really great way to build endurance.**

Building endurance means “training your body and your energy system to function for a longer time frame,” Kelvin Gary, owner and head coach at Body Space Fitness in NYC, tells SELF. “This, over time, will increase your body’s capacity to do work.” When your heart rate is stable throughout a cardio session, you’re able to push yourself longer before you get all tuckered out. (HIIT will also help improve your endurance, but you’ll reach your limit much quicker with these intense workouts.) As your muscles are challenged over a sustained period of time, the mitochondria—parts of your cells that mediate respiration and energy production—grow in number and size. This makes your muscles more efficient at using oxygen. Steady-state cardio also causes certain cardiovascular adaptations, which make your heart stronger and better equipped to do its job through long bouts of physical activity.

Building endurance is important for athletes of all levels, because it helps you push through workouts and is good for heart health. But endurance is critical for those who are training for a race—you’re not going to make it 6, 13, or 26 miles without it. If you’re following a training plan, you’ll notice long runs sprinkled amongst the shorter, quicker ones, exactly for this purpose.

Lots of people hate the idea of running at all, let alone for an extended period of time. Fortunately, if you’re not into hitting the track, you can get the same moderate-intensity cardio workout from plenty of other activities. Riding a bike, jumping rope, using a stair-climbing machine, or even spending some time on a rowing machine all work, too. You can really turn any cardio activity you like into steady-state if you keep tabs on your heart rate and keep it consistent. “The key is it actually being steady and aerobic where it’s conversational”—that is, your breathing is controlled enough that you can hold a conversation—“and the heart rate is relatively low,” Kalley says.
Steady-state cardio is also ideal for active recovery and is sometimes a necessary buffer between tough HIIT sessions.

“You can’t do five or six days in a row of high-intensity exercise,” Kalley says. “If you’re doing HIIT all the time, it’s just too much stress on your body, and it’s going to break you down. Some people will hit a wall and need to take days off, but for others it may mean injury or getting sick,” he explains. You may even start to see diminishing returns, meaning any progress you’re making will begin to slow down and eventually stagnate—as your body gets tired out, your workouts will become weaker, slower, and less effective. When you’re overworked, the work you do put it isn’t going to be quality anymore.

Instead of going hard every time you work out, try to alternate high-intensity days with steady-state ones (or even a full-out rest day). As a rule of thumb, Kalley says you shouldn’t do more than two legitimately hard workout days in a row. Giving your body time to recover in between allows you to come back even stronger on the harder days. Steady-state cardio is a great choice for those who don’t want a full day of complete inactivity but know they need to give the body a break.

Over the years, experts have found that steady-state cardio is probably not the quickest way to lose weight. But it’s still part of the weight-loss equation.

“Daily exercise at a low intensity so that you can do it for an extended period of time equals max calorie expenditure over the long haul,” Ball says. But the reality is that HIIT burns more calories in a shorter time period. Kalley adds that your body is less likely to adapt to high-intensity workouts, which can mean bigger changes. “When we talk about someone who’s trying to lose weight or get fit, there’s no doubt that HIIT gets you the most bang for your buck,” he says. Ball also notes that the afterburn effect is stronger after HIIT workouts than it is after steady-state “so you burn some extra calories after the exercise bout.”
Steady-state cardio also won’t help you put on the lean muscle you need to rev up your metabolism and aid weight loss. “You need to maintain a good level of muscle mass [to lose weight], which usually does not occur with doing just steady state cardio,” Gary says. Many HIIT workouts include resistance training, either with added weights or simply bodyweight moves. But steady-state cardio is still crucial to include in your routine because it keeps you actively moving, burning calories, and conditioning your heart so it’s prepared for all types of activity. No, the calories won’t burn off as quickly, but incorporating steady-state cardio into your weekly workouts gives you the ability to still move and break a sweat on recovery days instead of taking a day off completely. Moving more burns more calories over time.

At the end of the day, you need to train your body in different ways no matter what your ultimate goal is.

Whether you’re trying to lose weight or are gearing up for a triathlon, combining HIIT and steady-state workouts is the best way to keep challenging your muscles and improving your fitness. Too much of either workout can lead to overuse injuries and burnout.

By incorporating both training styles into your weekly fitness routine, you’ll train your cardiovascular system to work efficiently at all different levels of intensity, maximize calorie burn, and increase your overall endurance.

Race Relations Committee remains committed in its mission of promoting a diverse campus

Since its first meeting in May 2015, the committee has recommended similar committees and released a report of its findings.

A year and a half after the creation of Faculty Council’s Race Relations Committee and a year after the MU race-based demonstrations of last fall, the committee has published a
progress report in September about what they have learned about racism on campus and is still determined to resolve race issues on campus.

Their report outlined the different experiences, insights, and recommendations the committee had and expressed a desire to create similar committees across the UM system.

Some of the committee members became prominent figures during the on campus protests last fall, specifically Jonathan Butler and Mike Middleton. Butler was well-known for going on a hunger strike in November 2015 until then-UM System President Tim Wolfe resigned. Middleton became the interim president after Tim Wolfe’s resignation.

Despite the committee’s work in last fall’s events and since then, Chairman Berkley Hudson said he is worried that the campus has lost the sense of immediacy needed to resolve race issues.

“I still have a sadness, concern, worry that the urgency of last fall has dissipated,” Hudson said. “The urgency to address the tensions and conflicts of race relations has dissipated.”

Faculty Council created the committee after then-Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin held a listening session on Dec. 1, 2014, in response to the protests in Ferguson and protests on campus about Ferguson. During the session, the focus quickly shifted to the experiences of students and faculty on MU’s campus, so the administration began looking for someone who could lead a committee to discuss racial issues.

Craig Roberts, professor and Faculty Council chairman at the time, is one of the committee’s founding members. He appointed Hudson as chairman of the committee. Roberts also joined the committee because, after the listening session, he wanted to help the students who had suffered “a steady dose of discrimination.”

“I saw more ‘group pain’ and ‘group hurt’ than I have seen in a long time,” Roberts said in an email. “The students and some faculty were listing off everything that had happened to them, and most of it was subtle or unintentional mistreatment ... I began listening better. I came to see us living in the parallel universe. My world, which occurs alongside the world of my black colleagues, is completely different.”

Hudson said when the administration approached him to be the chairman of what would become the Race Relations Committee, he was initially wary.

“I was hesitant,” Hudson said. “I wasn’t so sure that the chancellor and the administration would be so supportive, but I met with them for about two hours and I was persuaded that Chancellor Loftin was serious about wanting to address problems with race relations on campus and that he would be supportive. So I agreed.”

Hudson said it took him a while to fill the committee because he wanted a diversity of viewpoints and people willing to talk.
“You have to include the wide range of viewpoints and backgrounds in any discussion that has to do with race,” Hudson said. “That’s what is very difficult to do: to get people comfortable enough to be uncomfortable, and talk about race and about their feelings, their attitude, their upbringings, their biases.”

Roberts also explained that the committee members were initially wary to talk because they were worried of being misunderstood, not believed, poorly expressed or ignorant.

“Any comment can trigger anger in the listener — individual or group,” Roberts said in his email. “The discussion can quickly escalate and bring the worst out of us. So we shut down. We begin opening up when we agree to listen and learn. I developed trust with the committee members, which made it possible to ask hard questions and offer controversial perspectives. It took trust to move ahead.”

During the committee’s creation, the founding members were concerned that there were not enough students on the committee. Typically, Faculty Council committees have no student representatives, but Hudson decided the committee needed two students.

The two students were 2016 graduate Corie Wilkens and then-graduate student Butler.

The committee also included a staff representative, Stephanie Hernandez, then-director of the Multicultural Center. This brought the number of committee members up to 12.

Besides having diversity of position, Hudson also wanted people on the committee who did not necessarily believe there were racial problems on campus. Some of these other perspectives were shown in the race relations report.

“I am unconvinced that institutional racism … is a current problem on the MU campus,” committee member Ray Massey said in the report. “I am convinced persons (students, staff and faculty) give negative treatment to those of other races.”

In his recommendations, he encouraged the inclusion of all voices in these types of conversations and a more positive repurposing of privilege.

“We should involve the Christian community in this repurposing,” Massey said in the report. “Christians should recognize and celebrate the blessings God has given them. Christians should recognize that God gives blessings to enable them to serve those less fortunate.”

Despite all the varying viewpoints, there was still one thing that all the committee members agreed on.

“Everyone had a deep heartfelt love for Mizzou, and that’s where we intersect,” Hudson said.

Hudson said he believes diverse viewpoints are necessary for this kind of committee.
“It can’t be everyone who shares the same outlook on this, or I don’t think we will make progress,” Hudson said.

Hudson said he is confident in the power of the committee, though. These committees can act as “greenhouses” that strengthen relationships across the campus.

“We all had a sense of immediacy, and we still today,” Hudson said.

He is hopeful that Kevin McDonald’s work as interim vice chancellor for inclusion and UM System chief diversity officer can, by having a permanent role, greatly help racial tensions on campus. Hudson said for the future, the committee will need McDonald’s “help in having administrative support.”

The committee’s goal, as indicated in their September report, is to develop more similar committees across the UM System. Besides having committees for campuses, there will ideally be committees for individual groups, like the College of Business or School of Medicine. Hudson called it “a bold, ambitious idea.”

Hudson said the populations are becoming increasingly more diverse, though, and the university needs to prepare for that kind of population.

“Missouri is the future of the United States, whether we like it or not,” Hudson said.

Loftin says change at MU will take time

Former Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin: “If we do something which is too hurried and too shallow, it becomes something that won't be sustainable.”

Former Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin said his “awakening” happened in December 2014.

“I went to a forum over here that we called together right after the Ferguson verdict was announced,” Loftin said, “That was my first time to really hear the stories from people's hearts. I went there thinking we were going to talk about Ferguson, and that didn't last long at all … within five minutes we were talking about other things: talking about not Ferguson, but Mizzou. And we had one student after the other standing up and talking about their own experiences here.”

After that, he said he began to realize the seriousness of the racial problems on campus. He went through a “deep self-examination,” which helped him address his own biases.

Then, the fall 2015 protests began.
During that time, Loftin had conversations with various student groups, including Concerned Student 1950, and attended meetings to help address problems on campus. After speaking with former UM System President Tim Wolfe, some MU deans and members of the Board of Curators, it became clear that his resignation was the next step for him to take.

“It wasn't an easy decision, obviously,” he said. “But, it's one of those things that after awhile you realize you have to make a very clear separation.”

Loftin realizes that his resignation might not have changed anything on campus. He said he told Concerned Student 1950 that their list of demands calling for institutional change would take time.

“I said, ‘These are not things that we can do quickly,’” he said. “I fully support them. I think we should do them. We should get to a different level of a mixture of our faculty and student body here, but it will not happen quickly.”

Loftin believes relying on short-term changes would only address superficial issues.

“If we do something which is too hurried and too shallow, it becomes something that won't be sustainable,” he said. “It will be a veneer that peels off after a while, and then we're worse off than when we started. So, the idea was to build systemic change. That was an ongoing conversation we were having all throughout 2015.”

He believes the problem comes from how some students at MU grew up. Many came from small towns with little diversity. Loftin, who grew up in the segregated South, said that the generational differences in beliefs make changing the campus climate especially difficult.

“And therein lies the problem: Will the students who are affected by this be that patient?” he asked. “I don't know the answer to that. I've talked to so many of them, and some of them are patient, and some of them aren't patient.”

He said it is normal for students who come to MU to expect to see change within their four years at the university. But for any change to happen, Loftin believes it requires many on campus to go through the same process he did in 2014.

“That's what we need more of: people to do that self-examination and self-reflection and really make an effort to try to change how you live your life so it won't lead you, even unconsciously, down the wrong pathway,” he said.
Analysis: For Donald Trump, getting elected was the easy part

BY STEVE KRASKE
skraske@kcstar.com

Now, can he govern?

Fresh off a wildly contentious campaign that had him fending off accusations of sexual assault while pulling off one of the unlikeliest upsets in American political history, Donald Trump will seek to lead a divided nation — a task that could prove as perilous as dashing across a freeway at rush hour.

The immediate aftermath of Trump’s win will be widespread shock that could result in big drops in the stock market Wednesday and international bewilderment at what U.S. voters just decided.

But the task of leading will soon begin, and few presidents have faced such a monumental challenge.

No president has ever assumed office with the country as angrily split as this one and with legions of Americans regarding their new leader as nothing more than a grandstanding liar.

That’s reflected in polls. More than half the country last week — fully 54 percent of voters — said in an NBC News/Wall Street Journal survey that they would not be prepared to support Trump as the nation’s 45th president.

Then there’s Congress where Democrats are expected to oppose Trump at every turn, whether it be the initiatives he seeks to pass or the conservative Supreme Court justices he wants to confirm. But he will have Republican majorities in both the House and Senate to help him along.
Corralling 100 senators and 435 members of the House will take time and patience, and some wonder if Trump has it within him to accomplish that.

“He's a divisive figure,” said University of Missouri political scientist Peverill Squire. “It would be hard for Democrats to support him. I suspect there will be a number of Republicans who will be uncomfortable with him as well.

“Presidents always have to assemble coalitions to support their proposals. That’s tough to do in a polarized environment. I worry a little bit about whether he can focus his efforts around a coherent set of policies.”

But Lloyd Smith, a former executive director of the Missouri Republican Party, said Trump will understand that building those coalitions is exactly what he needs to do to be successful.

“I think he’ll unite the American people in a way that they begin to see that it’s a new day and a new time with new leadership,” he said.

One problem, critics have pointed out, is Trump’s proposals are inconsistent. He wants more money for infrastructure and extending Social Security. But he also wants to cut taxes. Those proposals would add huge totals to the federal budget deficit, a position that the Republican Party has long opposed.

“Things just don’t add up,” Squire said.

Expect Trump to be a heavy-duty delegator while leaving much of the day-to-day running of the country to his running mate, Mike Pence, said Emporia State University political scientist Michael Smith.

“(President) Reagan was a big-time delegator,” he said. “Trump would take that to the next level.”

Missouri Sen. Claire McCaskill, a Democrat, insisted that if Trump is to be successful in any way, he’s going to have to learn how to work with Congress. That, she said, is a very different proposition than cutting real estate deals.

“The art of the deal is one thing in business,” she said. “It’s a completely different deal in government and international diplomacy.”
McCaskill said Trump’s penchant for bluff and bluster may be effective in negotiating deals, but it won’t be effective in working with members of Congress who are driven by their own agendas.

Trump, she added, has got to find a way to curb his insatiable desire to be the center of attention.

“He’s got to try to make it about something other than himself,” McCaskill said. “He’s got to meet people halfway. He’s got to not be obsessive about being the winner in every situation.”

The real estate mogul has one advantage, and that is a clearly articulated multi-pronged agenda for his first 100 days in office as well as his first day in office, Republicans noted.

Priority one? Repealing the Affordable Care Act. Trump has trumpeted that cause in the wake of recent reports that Obamacare insurance premiums will rise by double digits in 2017.

“Just think what we could accomplish in the first 100 days,” Trump told supporters at a rally in Ohio.

On Day One, Trump has pledged to tackle more than a dozen measures. Among them: renegotiating NAFTA, withdrawing from the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal, nominating a replacement for Antonin Scalia on the U.S. Supreme Court and removing illegal immigrants.

Trump has also proposed congressional term limits, a federal hiring freeze and a five-year ban on White House and congressional officials becoming lobbyists.

Altogether, Trump’s game plan is easier to grasp than Hillary Clinton’s, said John Hancock, the Missouri Republican Party chairman.

“We have a clearer idea of what a Trump presidency is going to look like certainly in the short term than what a Clinton presidency looks like,” he said.

Hancock said one challenge for Trump will be making peace with many members of Congress whom he’s feuded with over the months, especially those such as Missouri’s U.S. Rep. Ann Wagner, who un-endorsed him following his comments about sexually assaulting women.

“But I think he has the capacity to do that,” Hancock said.
No matter what he does, any hope for a working relationship with congressional Democrats appears to be little more than a pipe dream. Trump and Democrats have waged highly personal battles in recent months that make trustful relations nearly impossible.

“I would’ve been disappointed if John McCain or Mitt Romney was elected president,” said Roy Temple, chairman of the Missouri Democratic Party. “But I wouldn’t have felt the country was in peril.

“But Donald Trump is a threat to every institution our democracy holds dear.”

What Trump needs, Temple said, is “a sweeping gesture of goodwill that shows a belief in the institutions that run our republic.”

Missouri’s U.S. Rep. Vicky Hartzler, a Harrisonville Republican, had a different view. She said she was optimistic about the months ahead.

Trump “will continue to set the tone with the change we need,” she said. “It’s up to us in Congress to set the policy.”

**Trump Victory Jolts Higher Ed**

Many academic leaders fear the president-elect could scare off foreign students, encourage discord on campuses and promote the anti-intellectualism that won him broad support from non-college-educated males. UPDATE: American Council on Education congratulates president-elect.

**No MU Mention**

Donald Trump stunned the pundits and confounded the pollsters on Tuesday by being elected president of the United States. Many in higher education -- including many college leaders who had long lists of objections to Hillary Clinton’s plan for free public higher education -- were horrified by the prospect of a Trump presidency.
The Republican candidate regularly attacked colleges as politically correct, his comments about non-Americans in the United States worried many college leaders who depend on international students, and he rejected consensus science about climate change and other topics. His student supporters on campus -- in many cases outnumbered but active nonetheless -- set off a series of conflicts and debates about free speech with in-your-face tactics such as building fake walls to symbolize the one Trump vowed to build on the border with Mexico.

Nobody really knows what a Trump administration will be like, given how unorthodox his campaign was, his desire to shake up Washington, his lack of policy details and deep fissures between the president-elect and congressional leaders on both sides of the aisle.

UPDATE: On Wednesday morning, Molly Corbett Broad, president of the American Council on Education, issued this statement: "The American Council on Education (ACE) congratulates Donald J. Trump on his election as the nation’s 45th president. I join more than 4,000 college and university presidents and other higher education leaders across the country in wishing President-elect Trump well as he prepares to embark on his term in January and address the many challenges facing our nation at home and abroad. The entire higher education community looks forward to working with the Trump administration on key issues such as expanding access to educational opportunity, increasing levels of attainment and supporting cutting-edge research and innovation."

It wasn't until mid-October that Trump devoted a significant portion of a speech to higher education. In that talk, he said he worried about graduates facing high student debt levels and endorsed income-based repayment systems (something generally backed by Democrats and Republicans alike).

In the speech, Trump vowed to force colleges to cut tuition rates. "If the federal government is going to subsidize student loans, it has a right to expect that colleges work hard to control costs and invest their resources in their students," Trump said. "If colleges refuse to take this responsibility seriously, they will be held accountable."

And he said that accountability would include ending the tax-exempt status of colleges and universities with large endowments that do not use those funds to cut tuition rates. Colleges need "to spend endowments on their students, not themselves …. They need to use that money to cut the college debt and cut tuition, and they have to do it quickly."

Many college leaders have criticized attacks on university endowments, noting that large shares of college endowments are restricted in their use, and that many of the colleges and universities that have the most generous financial aid policies are among those with the largest endowments.
Trump also said colleges could save money by eliminating the "tremendous bloat" in their administrations.

While Trump blamed colleges for rising tuitions, he also blamed the federal government. He cited a controversial 2015 study by Vanderbilt University that said it spent $150 million a year to comply with federal regulations. Trump cited the $150 million figure and said he would work to roll back regulations that lead colleges to spend in that way.

But as critics noted when the study came out, about $117 million of those costs related to federal research regulations, which are a sizable issue at a major research university such as Vanderbilt. So most of the $150 million had very little to do with what undergraduates pay.

Trump's emphasis on endowments is something he has come back to a few times. In remarks in September, he said, "Instead these universities use the money to pay their administrators, to put donors' names on their buildings, or just store the money, keep it and invest it. In fact, many universities spend more on private equity fund managers than on tuition programs .... But they should be using the money on students, for tuition, for student life and for student housing. That's what it's supposed to be for."

'Extreme Vetting'

While Trump has consistently called for making it more difficult for noncitizens to enter the United States, he has shifted a bit during the campaign on how he would do that.

In December, Trump called for a temporary ban on all Muslims entering the U.S., citing the “great hatred towards Americans by large segments of the Muslim population.” (A national cochair for Trump's campaign, Sam Clovis, told Inside Higher Ed in December that the proposed ban would indeed apply to Muslim international students.) He appeared to back away from that position a bit in the months that followed.

Then in August, he proposed putting in place an ideological test for admission to the United States and temporarily suspending visa processing from regions “that have a history of exporting terrorism."

He said at the time that the U.S. should admit only “those who share our values and respect our people.”

“In the Cold War we had an ideological screening test,” said Trump. “The time is overdue to develop a new screening test for the threats we face today. I call it extreme vetting. I call it extreme, extreme vetting.”

“In addition to screening out all members of the sympathizers of terrorist groups, we must also screen out any who have hostile attitudes toward our country or its principles or who believe that sharia law should supplant American law. Those
who do not believe in our Constitution or who support bigotry and hatred will not be admitted for immigration into our country. Only those who we expect to flourish in our country and to embrace a tolerant American society should be issued visas.”

He also said that he would ask the Departments of Homeland Security and State to “identify a list of regions where adequate screening cannot take place. There are many such regions. We will stop processing visas from those areas until such time as it is deemed safe to resume based on new circumstances or new procedures.”

Many in international education expressed concerns at the time that such a policy could make it extremely difficult for students from Muslim nations to get visas. Others worried that a Trump victory would send such students seeking a Western-style education to Canada, Australia or other countries not seen as hostile.

In a statement that was unusually public for academic administrators (who typically try to avoid even the appearance of endorsing a candidate), 10 college and university presidents joined with foreign policy and international education experts last month to call for the next president (candidates were not named) to support diversity, diplomacy and an international outlook for the United States.

The statement -- widely seen as backing Clinton over Trump -- was coordinated by NAFSA: Association of International Educators. Marlene M. Johnson, executive director and CEO of the organization, said via email Tuesday night that "there is so much at stake for all of our citizens as well as for the international community in how we choose to move forward now that the campaign season is over." She said that the priorities of those who promote international exchange would be unchanged: "To actively advocate for U.S. policies that create a more welcoming and globally engaged United States."

**The Trump Chalkings**

Many colleges have also debated free speech issues that have come up because of the Trump campaign. Student supporters of Trump used chalk messages -- just as supporters of other candidates have done -- on campus walkways. Many minority students viewed these expressions as hostile, as sometimes they went beyond just expressing support for Trump. Consider the photo above, of a chalking at the University of California, San Diego, that expressed support for Trump, and also said "Build the Wall. Deport Them All."

At the University of Michigan, chalkings in March said, "Trump 2016," but also "Stop Islam."

Trump held many rallies at public university campuses, which are of course ideal venues for large rallies. Numerous times universities were criticized for allowing
him to hold these events, although officials repeatedly noted that, as public institutions, they could not impose political tests on which candidates to permit to hold rallies. And at some events Trump held on public university campuses, students who opposed him said they were harassed or threatened.

At the University of Illinois at Chicago in March, a large Donald Trump rally was called off as it was about to start, with organizers saying that threats of violence required that action. Before the decision was announced, hundreds of anti-Trump protesters had entered the university arena where the event was being held while thousands of protesters were outside. Press reports indicated that there were numerous scuffles between pro- and anti-Trump attendees. Many of the protesters also were angry at the removal of some of the anti-Trump attendees from the rally.

Anti-Trump students and others shouted, "We stopped Trump," after the rally was called off, and shared anti-Trump signs in person and online. Many of the anti-Trump students suggested that it was the threat of protest, not violence, that led Trump to change his plans.

Young Voters

An analysis of polling data by the Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, at Tufts University, found that young voters, those aged 18-29, backed Clinton over Trump. And the center noted that this continues a pattern from Britain's Brexit vote, in which young people voted to stay in the European Union, but older voters wanted to leave. (The age group analyzed includes many students but also non-students.)

In this year’s U.S. election, the analysis found, Clinton won 55 percent of the vote to 37 percent for Trump. But Trump beat Clinton among white people in the 18-29 age group, 48 percent to 43 percent. Among African Americans, the split was 83 percent to 9 percent (for Clinton) and among Latinos in that age group, the split was 70 percent to 24 percent.

The group also found that more young people (around 8 percent) backed third party candidates this year than was the case four years ago when President Obama was running for re-election.

What’s Next?

Judging from social media Tuesday night as Clinton seemed to move from likely winner to likely loser, many academics are in despair.

But John R. Thelin, university research professor at the University of Kentucky, and author of A History of American Higher Education (Johns Hopkins University Press), said via email that academe will survive a Trump administration.

"If Donald Trump wins the presidency, the losses for higher education will not be as dire as feared by higher ed advocates," Thelin said. "The strengths and
weaknesses of U.S. higher education are deep and, hence, impervious to any single candidate or election."

Added Thelin, "Donald Trump is very proud of his degree from the University of Pennsylvania’s Wharton School. For all his bombast, he knows that our colleges and universities are good and significant."

The Chronicle of Higher Education

NO MENTION

What if a President Really Did Shut Down the Dept. of Education?

By Sarah Brown NOVEMBER 08, 2016

For several decades the Department of Education has been a popular target for Republican political candidates eager to slash the size of the federal government. Among the recent champions of doing away with the department, or at least gutting it, is Donald J. Trump. "I may cut Department of Education," Mr. Trump said last fall in an interview with Fox News. He was responding to a question about how he would curb government spending, and followed that comment with a criticism of the Common Core state-based educational standards.
Mr. Trump has repeated his distaste for the department on several occasions this year as he’s been pressed on how he would pay for his tax-cut plan.

And in a book Mr. Trump published last year, *Crippled America: How to Make America Great Again*, he wrote: "A lot of people believe the Department of Education should just be eliminated. Get rid of it. If we don’t eliminate it completely, we certainly need to cut its power and reach. Education has to be run locally."

Besides those statements, Mr. Trump has been light on specifics. It’s not clear whether he would eliminate the whole department or just cut most of the programs, whether he would seek to lay off the agency’s 4,400 employees, or even whether he would make any of this a priority. His campaign did not respond to a request from *The Chronicle* for details.

But his proposal by no means makes him an outlier. Ted Cruz, a Republican primary opponent, said he would abolish the department and shift federal education funding to a block-grant model. Gary Johnson, the Libertarian presidential candidate, would get rid of the department "very quickly."

In fact, ever since the department was created in 1979 politicians have had it in the cross hairs. The law establishing it barely passed the House of Representatives, said Christopher T. Cross, a former assistant secretary of education under George W. Bush, and some critics viewed it as a "payoff" from Jimmy Carter to the National Education Association in exchange for the group’s endorsement in the 1976 presidential election.

"The opposition to the department goes back 40 years," Mr. Cross said. "It was very deep and very bitter at the time."

Ronald Reagan promised to ax the department during his 1980 presidential campaign, though he later backed off the pledge after failing to drum up support in Congress. Despite that defeat, proposals to eliminate or streamline the agency "have become a litmus test in presidential nominating politics on the Republican side," said Patrick J. McGuinn, an associate professor of political science at Drew University.

What’s notable about 2016, Mr. McGuinn said, is that the Obama administration’s Department of Education has been more activist than that of any previous administration when it comes to holding both schools and colleges accountable. And the Bush-era department "was the runner up," he said. That means backlash against the agency has strengthened since 2000.

So it’s worth pondering the question: What would a higher-education world without the Department of Education look like?
An Era of Privatization

If Mr. Trump won the presidency and decided he wanted to eliminate the department, he would probably need a friendly House of Representatives and Senate ruled by Republican leaders who could be persuaded to introduce a bill that would abolish it.

Passing such legislation would only be step one. "You can’t just say, We’re going to sign a law and dismantle the department," Mr. Cross said. "There’s so much to be sorted through."

When candidates who favor eliminating the department have been asked to elaborate on how they would do so, they have often responded with statements like, "Of course we would keep the parts that work," said Alexander Holt, a policy analyst at New America, a think tank.

But simply moving programs around wouldn’t save money or reduce the federal government’s size, Mr. Holt said. "It doesn’t matter if you abolish the Department of Education if you retain every single part of the Department of Education," he said.

Let’s say Mr. Trump, or another president, really managed to abolish the entire department, including all of the programs, loans, and grants it oversees. The most significant issue would be the $1.3-trillion federal-student-loan portfolio, Mr. Holt said. About 44 million people have student loans through the federal government.

The portfolio could be privatized, Mr. Holt said. But it’s unlikely that a private actor would buy it, he said, because it’s not profitable without federal subsidies — so the government would probably have to pay a private-sector company to phase out the student-loan system. No new loans would be issued. Low-income students would stop receiving Pell Grants.

Without the department, agency-run programs like Upward Bound, which offers support and advising to disadvantaged high-school students as they prepare for college, would no longer exist.

Roxanne Schroeder-Arce, an assistant professor of theater education at the University of Texas at Austin, said she wouldn’t have made it to college without Upward Bound. "For a person like me, from a very poor family with no higher education in any of my lineage, then college wouldn’t have been a possibility," she said. "We didn’t have the resources, the knowledge, or the networks of support to make that possible."

Accreditation would lose whatever teeth it has, as it’s tied to financial aid, Mr. Cross said. So would enforcement of Title IX, the gender-equity law — and the Office for
Civil Rights, which enforces that law, would no longer exist anyway. Also gone would be the National Center for Education Statistics, which collects troves of data on demographics and outcomes. Abolishing the center would make it harder to find reliable information on colleges’ performance.

With all federal financial aid cut off, Mr. Holt said, most private and for-profit colleges would very likely close. That would in turn cause thousands of people to lose their jobs and devastate the economies in which the colleges reside, he said.

**Who’d Pick Up the Slack?**

That’s a doomsday scenario. But let’s take a step back. The programs run by the department were created through acts of Congress. Eliminating them would also require Congress to act — either to repeal them or to not fund them through the federal budget. It's hard to imagine lawmakers shutting down something as popular as the Pell Grant program.

So a President Trump might decide to get rid of the Department of Education but continue some of its activities, such as distributing financial aid. The remaining programs would have to be overseen by a different agency.

The student-loan system could be moved to the Department of the Treasury, Mr. Holt said. But that department doesn’t have any experience handling student aid, he said, so there would be a huge learning curve. Given the workload, that shift might also require a staffing increase.

As long as federal financial aid continues to exist, there’s a need for accreditation, Mr. Cross said. Accrediting agencies must be approved by the federal government, he said, so there would have to be a small staff in another department to manage that work.

Enforcement of Title IX would probably fall to the Department of Justice, Mr. Cross said. Still, he said, "I don’t know how you’d have the oversight and enforcement activities that you have now."

Though resistance to the department has grown during the Bush and Obama years, political pressures would complicate even introducing a bill to eliminate the department, experts say.

Federal education spending touches all 435 congressional districts and 50 states, and most members of Congress would be reluctant to support laws that would affect that
flow of money. Democrats have become adept at arguing that, if you’re against the Department of Education, you’re against education itself, Mr. McGuinn said.

The department is often held up as an example of bureaucratic bloat, Mr. McGuinn said, but it’s actually one of the most efficient parts of the government, in terms of its ratio of employees to how much money it distributes through its programs. "If anything," he said, "it’s understaffed."

‘An Idea With Some Legitimacy’

Richard K. Vedder, director of the Center for College Affordability and Productivity, has a different take. He sees the department’s footprint on many problems that negatively affect colleges. Eliminating the department, he said, "isn’t one of those off-the-cuff Trump remarks meant to shock people. It’s an idea with some legitimacy."

For instance, Mr. Vedder believes colleges have been able to push up tuition and fees more quickly because the department gives out so much in financial aid. The higher sticker prices may have driven some low-income students away, he said. And the department’s recently ramped-up enforcement of Title IX has imposed what Mr. Vedder considers a legally dubious standard on colleges’ investigations of sexual misconduct.

"I would like to see it put out of existence," Mr. Vedder said of the department, "but I accept that that’s less likely to happen."

He’d at least like to see a downsizing of the federal role in student aid and more experimentation with "alternative ways of financing," such as income-share agreements. Pell Grants could become more of a voucher program and be distributed directly to low-income students, he said.

Mr. Trump has painted eliminating the department as a way to ease regulation and cut red tape for schools and colleges, Ms. Schroeder-Arce said. But he’s also expressed a desire to make colleges answer for student outcomes. "How do we hold colleges accountable without federal programs?" she asked. "What he’s saying is inconsistent — it doesn’t add up."

Even without a department, the federal government wouldn’t cut all ties with higher education, as many colleges would still receive millions of dollars in research funding.

And eliminating the department altogether is a long shot. Still, a President Trump could reduce the agency’s authority substantially by lobbying for cuts to its budget
and staff, Mr. McGuinn said. That worries him, in part because states, when left to their own devices, haven’t provided much oversight of higher education.

"Many concerns about higher education are universal," such as access, affordability, and outcomes, he said. "How do you address those in the absence of federal policy and a federal department?"

---
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Trump’s Surprise Victory Sends Shock Through Higher Ed
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Donald J. Trump’s upset victory in the presidential race early Wednesday morning, after an acrimonious campaign that cast a harsh light on deep racial divisions across the United States, stunned higher-education leaders and left many questioning what his administration would mean for colleges.

Mr. Trump’s win represented one of the most surprising results in a presidential election in decades. He defeated Hillary Clinton, the Democratic nominee and former secretary of state, thanks in large part to a groundswell of populist support among white, working-class voters without college degrees. During the campaign, he angered many Americans with pronouncements and policy proposals that singled out Muslims, Hispanics, and African-Americans, among other groups, potentially frightening off international students, and he earned widespread condemnation for his remarks and his actions toward women.
Mr. Trump overcame sagging poll numbers in the weeks leading up to the election, which had predicted a comfortable win for Mrs. Clinton. Now that the prospect of a Trump presidency has become a reality, students, professors, and others in higher education are left to wonder how the business mogul and former reality-television star will treat colleges and universities in an administration that very well may prove as unconventional and unprecedented as the campaign itself.

For much of the race, Mr. Trump offered few clues about his specific plans for higher education. During the Republican primary fight, he received significant attention over fraud claims and lawsuits related to Trump University, a shuttered venture that offered training seminars in business and real estate. Those claims faded from the headlines as the campaign progressed, but nothing resembling a true higher-education platform emerged in their place. He did speak about higher education last month at a rally in Ohio, but he focused much of his attention on an income-based repayment plan that observers described as generous to student-loan borrowers.

By the time the campaign reached its final month, some policy experts had lamented Mr. Trump’s presidential bid as a missed opportunity for Republicans to shape the public debate over higher education.

For now, the biggest and most lasting imprint of his abrasive campaign may be apparent in the charged climate on college campuses — one that could worsen after his surprise victory. Across the country, colleges have grappled with questions of diversity and inclusion that arose in part because of Mr. Trump’s divisive rhetoric.

He proved to be a deeply unpopular candidate for many people, but especially those in academe. More broadly, he proved less popular than usual among Republican nominees with college-educated white voters.

White male voters without a college degree largely powered his stunning victory. That leaves academic leaders facing an existential question: What’s their place in a society with which they now appear to be so profoundly out of touch?

'Uncharted Territory'

As election results were called in, Franita Tolson, a professor of voting rights at Florida State University’s College of Law, said she always thought the race would be close, mainly because it’s an election that’s been notoriously hard to poll. And the polling difficulties may also be why academics were in such shock on Tuesday night, she said.
More than other elections, during this race voters felt a deep and personal connection to the candidates, and it’s a connection that’s giving academics perspective on what the world outside the ivory tower values, Ms. Tolson said.

“People also feel an emotional connection to the candidate in a way that we tend to overlook falls that would probably doom any other candidate,” Ms. Tolson said. “Politics based on emotion,” she added, are “tied to anti-intellectualism.”

The anti-intellectual movement is not just tied to the current electorate, but is reflected in state legislatures and trickles down to future generations, she said. For example, state legislatures’ discussions about the lesser value of certain majors, like those in the liberal arts, or their moves to slash funding for colleges show voters higher education isn’t a priority for elected officials. Costs are passed onto students and their families, she said, and a pattern of anti-intellectualism is passed on to a new generation of voters.

“That’s the risk of trying to appeal to the everyday man, by de-emphasizing the importance of education, you run into a situation where education is put on the back burner and then institutions of higher education experience significant cuts and then we have trouble preparing the next generation of voters,” Ms. Tolson said. “I do see it as probably the biggest and honestly the saddest fallout of how our political system has developed.”

Angus Johnston, a historian of student activism who teaches at the City University of New York’s Hostos Community College, said this race highlighted that the lines between political speech and hate speech had grown blurrier.

The race was largely perceived as a statement of national values, he said, and how people on campuses deal with the country’s new political identity will be a tough dynamic for students and campus leaders alike to grapple with. And for activists, the stakes are going to be higher, for groups on all parts of the political spectrum.

“We are going into uncharted territory here,” Mr. Johnston said. “We have had for a while some very powerful and growing divides on the campus, and I think the question of how to resolve those contradictions, it’s just gotten a lot more urgent.”

University administrators may be unsure of how to interpret the election’s outcome, he said, and figuring out how to deal with the aftermath will take time.

“If something is a refutation of your assumptions and your expectations, humility kind of demands that you take a few moments before you start talking about what it means
or what it portends,” Mr. Johnston said. “Clearly, we don’t know as much as we thought we did about what the future holds.”

**Focus on Contentious Discussions**

Kevin Kruger, president of Naspa, an association of student-affairs administrators, said the reaction to Mr. Trump’s victory would not be immediate. But he expected that the continued trend of outcry and protests from minority students would continue with even greater intensity.

“This political debate has been one of the most contentious in our history, and we would expect some of those issues would play out on campuses,” he said.

Nancy Thomas, director of the Institute for Democracy and Higher Education at Tufts University, held an informal conference call with faculty members and administrators from several campuses to discuss what preparations they were making for after the election. Few, however, were doing much of anything to facilitate dialogue, she said.

At Tufts, Ms. Thomas said, the institute was going to open a room, provide snacks, and let students share their thoughts on a big sheet of butcher paper. There are no rules about what they can write, she said. If students don’t like what they’re reading, they are free to respond with their own sentiments.

Regardless of the outcome, however, Ms. Thomas said, colleges are realizing that preparing students for the contentious discussions sparked by the election is the primary work of higher education. The challenge will be in accomplishing that goal in an environment with such charged opinions between various groups of people that may share many interests but differ in their lived experience and political views. “I think relationships are in trouble,” she said.

Jerry L. Falwell Jr., president of Liberty University, a private, Christian institution in Virginia, said Mr. Trump’s victory was a peaceful revolution, of sorts, by the “common man” against the elitist establishment in Washington, D.C.

Despite the likely fallout at other colleges, Mr. Falwell said he expects the mood on his campus to be cheerful and civil following Tuesday’s vote. While some students at Liberty had protested Mr. Falwell’s support of the Republican nominee, Mr. Falwell asserted that news-media reports had overplayed their dissent. There were students who supported both major-party candidates as well as a number of third-party candidates, he said. Yet the dialogue on his campus was civil, he said.
Mr. Falwell expressed relief that Mrs. Clinton’s proposal for tuition-free college would not be enacted, calling that measure a potential disaster for all but the wealthiest private universities. Instead, under President Trump, he said, the role of many colleges would be to better train minority and inner-city residents for an increase in jobs.

**MU School of Medicine associate dean resigns, is replaced**

School of Medicine spokeswoman Mary Jenkins: “Dr. Laine Young-Walker brings excellent credentials and training to her new role.”

**Laine Young-Walker, an assistant professor of clinical psychiatry in the Department of Psychiatry, is the School of Medicine’s new associate dean for student programs and professional development at MU’s School of Medicine after Rachel Brown stepped down from the position on Oct. 28.**

Brown held the position since 2006. Over the last 10 years, she has been responsible for overseeing the admission process, observing student services and taking part in various curriculum initiatives. While she has resigned from her position as associate dean, she still retains her position as professor of clinical psychiatry.

Her replacement, Young-Walker, also works for the psychiatry department. Additionally, Young-Walker is the vice chair of the psychiatry department and acts as chief of the division of child and adolescent psychiatry at MU’s School of Medicine.

School of Medicine spokeswoman Mary Jenkins said in an email that Young-Walker has compiled many years of experience and training.

Jenkins said that in becoming an associate dean, Young-Walker will be giving up her vice chair position. Jenkins said she has high hopes for the success which is to be ushered in by Young-Walker.

“As the new associate dean for student programs, Dr. Laine Young-Walker brings excellent credentials and training to her new role,” Jenkins said in the email.

Jenkins said it is against policy to comment on the specifics for Brown’s resignation, but said one of the reasons Brown resigned is because she hopes to continue her academic work as a clinical psychiatry professor. The School of Medicine itself has recently been under the microscope after the school was flagged for issues regarding diversity and fair and equal
treatment of students. In response to the issues brought up, the school must provide a formal action plan by December of this year, drawing out the actions which will be taken in order to remedy the issues currently at hand.