



MU News Bureau

Daily Clips Packet

July 11, 2017

THE KANSAS CITY STAR.

MISSOURIAN

Guest commentary: What The New York Times got wrong about MU and its 2015 protests

BY NATHAN WILLETT

This week The New York Times published a story by reporter Anemona Hartocollis that painted an unreasonably and inaccurately bleak image of our proud university. Despite having spoken both with myself and the president of the Mizzou student lobbying group, the Associated Students of the University of Missouri, Hartocollis included nothing from either interview in her final story. It is reasonable to assume that the exclusion of these interviews — and who knows how many others — seems to have been driven by the fact that they did not fit into the more simplistic, yet flawed picture that she wished to paint. In her portrayal, the protests have caused an entirely negative impact on our university, and are the sole driver of down enrollment. However, this simply is not true.

The reality of Mizzou's current state of affairs is far more complex than Hartocollis' story would suggest. I will not deny that the events of 2015 have played a sizeable role in the decreased enrollment that our university faces today, but we cannot acknowledge this fact without also acknowledging facts such as decreased population sizes among the age group currently going into college. Moreover, there is a major factor to consider in increased SEC recruitment in traditionally Mizzou-dominated out of state markets such as Illinois.

Adding to all of this, the Missouri General Assembly voted in one of the largest non-recession budget cuts to higher education in state history, resulting in over 400 lost staff and faculty positions and a substantial negative impact on our ability to recruit and hire. It is only once considering all of these complex aspects that one begins to have a more complete picture of the various factors all playing a role in today's enrollment numbers.

The New York Times was correct, however, in pointing out that the events which took place on campus in the fall of 2015 appeared far more dramatic off campus than on. This can be statically shown through the fact that the enrollment drop has come from new students, rather than students transferring away. In fact, in the time since the events of 2015, Mizzou has experienced the third highest retention rate in its history. In other words, those who were at Mizzou during the protests of 2015 were not driven away by what they experienced. Despite misleading

representations by the national media in 2015, the protests of that semester did not shut down campus. Classes went on as scheduled and the university's mission to educate its students was uninterrupted.

That is not to diminish the protests, but rather to point out that Mizzou managed to balance expression of students' unalienable First Amendment rights and still provide an educational experience that was unimpeded. The protests were entirely peaceful and nonviolent, yet rather than celebrating this example of exactly the kind of civic expression our Founding Fathers had envisioned, this university has been repeatedly punished for it by the national press and our own state legislature.

Despite all of this, tremendous progress has been made at our university since the events of 2015. Our administration created the position of vice chancellor for inclusion, diversity and equity, whose office has made a series of recommendations taken up by the university to address racial disparities in faculty and staff numbers, in addition to creating a mandatory diversity training for all at Mizzou, including incoming students. We have welcomed in a new system president and university chancellor, both of whom are dedicated to putting students first and ensuring that Mizzou offers the best educational experience possible to all who attend.

But most importantly, 2015 fundamentally changed the way administrators at our university view students. Today more than ever, students at Mizzou are viewed as stakeholders whose opinions and voices matter. One of the first things our new system president and university chancellor did upon taking office was meet with student leaders to hear their input on the pressing matters facing our university. The result has been record turnout in student government elections, and student engagement on campus is at an all-time high. More than ever before, students are playing an active role here at Mizzou, and our university is only the better for it. This is the true impact of 2015, and this is what people across the nation and here in Missouri should look at with pride.

Unfortunately, the article published in The New York Times this week would appear to be an example of a journalist who had already decided exactly what she was going to say before ever speaking to anyone actually here on campus. But Mizzou knows better.

This is not a university on the decline. We are facing some challenging times, and it does us no good to deny it. We have much more work to do, but there are wonderful things happening on our campus, and more to come. We live in the Show-Me State, and we need to do a better job of showing off all that our university has to offer. The quality of instruction at Mizzou and integrity of our student body continue to be the envy of schools across the nation.

We are the flagship university of the incredible state of Missouri, with groundbreaking research and exceptional academic achievements occurring each and every day right here in Columbia. This is a university to be proud of, and I for one cannot wait to see what the future holds for Mizzou.

Nathan Willett is president of the Missouri Students Association, the undergraduate student government for the University of Missouri.

The Washington Post

The new culture war targeting American universities appears to be working

BY PHILIP BUMP

In late 2015, the University of Missouri was wracked by protests demanding the resignation of the school's president in light of his perceived failure to address racist incidents on campus. The demonstrations quickly gained national attention, and, when the school's football team joined in, they were successful.

Since then, as the New York Times reported Monday, the school has stumbled. In the two years after those protests, enrollment has dropped by more than 35 percent. The new president of the system blames those demonstrations, which both drew attention to the school's problems while likely making other students leery of attending a university saturated with protests.

The damage from strife on college campuses, though, may have been wider than that. Since 2015, as attention has been focused by conservative media on tensions at universities, views of higher education as an institution have plummeted among Republicans.

That's the finding of a new survey from Pew Research released on Monday. It asked respondents if they viewed various institutions as having a net positive or net negative effect on the country. For no institution was the gulf between Democrats and Republicans wider than on the role of colleges and universities — wider even than the gap on the national news media.

This is a new development. As recently as 2015, most Republicans agreed that the effect of colleges was a positive one. Since then, that percentage has plunged, though views among Democrats have remained consistent.

Now, more than half of Republicans think that colleges and universities have a negative effect on our culture.

Only among moderate Republicans was the annual drop in views of the role of colleges not consistent. Among younger Republicans, views of the effect of higher education sank by 21 points since 2015, though among every subset of that population, views dropped by at least 10 points.

Why? Certainly in part because conservative media focused its attention on the idea of "safe spaces" on college campuses, places where students would be sheltered from controversial or upsetting information or viewpoints. This idea quickly spread into a broader critique of left-wing

culture, but anecdotal examples from individual universities, such as objections to scheduled speakers and warnings in classrooms, became a focal point.

Google searches for “safe spaces” were basically nonexistent before the end of 2015; by 2016 and into 2017, they were much more common.

We can’t definitively say that it was this focus on the perceived cultural elitism of colleges and universities that so dramatically shifted Republicans’ perceptions of the institution. That decline in confidence, though, clearly overlaps with a period during which attention was drawn to college campuses by conservative media.

At the University of Missouri, the repercussions of that campus tension were tangible. Pew’s polling suggests that the short-term effects on our politics may be as well.



Deep Partisan Divide on Higher Education

In dramatic shift, more than half of Republicans now say colleges have a negative impact on the U.S., with wealthier, older and more educated Republicans being least positive.

BY PAUL FAIN

Republicans have soured on higher education, with more than half now saying that colleges have a negative impact on the United States.

An annual survey by the Pew Research Center on Americans’ views of national institutions, released this week, found a dramatic attitude shift on higher education among Republicans and people who lean Republican, with the change occurring across most demographic and ideological groups.

Two years ago, 54 percent of Republicans said colleges had a positive impact on the country’s direction, with 37 percent rating higher education negatively. That ratio shifted to 43 percent positive and 45 percent negative last year.

The latest version of the survey, conducted last month among 2,504 adults, for the first time found a majority (58 percent) of Republicans saying colleges have a negative effect, compared to 36 percent saying they have a positive effect.

A gradual increase in the number of Democrats and Democratic leaners who view higher education positively helped counterbalance the increasingly negative take by Republicans. In the latest version of the survey, 72 percent of Democrats viewed colleges positively (up from 65 percent in 2010) compared to a negative response from 19 percent this year.

Pew also found an increasing partisan divide on views about the national news media, although not as rapid a shift as Republicans' take on higher education.

The public's overall views on national institutions -- including churches, banks and labor unions -- did not change much in this latest installment. On higher education, 55 percent of all respondents had a positive view.

The partisan stratification is apparent even within the GOP. Nearly two-thirds of conservative Republicans (65 percent) said colleges have a negative impact, compared to 43 percent of moderate and liberal Republicans.

Viewers of right-leaning news media might not be surprised by Pew's findings. Virtually every day Fox News, Breitbart and other conservative outlets run critical articles about free speech disputes on college campuses, typically with coverage focused on the perceived liberal orthodoxy and political correctness in higher education.

For example, Breitbart on Monday riffed on a report from The New York Times about a 35 percent enrollment decline at the University of Missouri at Columbia in the two years since racially charged protests occurred at the flagship university.

Bogus right-wing outlets also often target higher education. A fictitious story about California college students cutting off their genitals to protest Trump's Mexican border wall plan recently made the rounds on purported news sites and social media.

In addition, Republican politicians in recent years have pushed back on the four-year degree, saying that not all jobs require the credential. Some also question the value of four-year degrees and criticize increasing college tuition levels.

Research has shown, however, that a healthy majority of faculty members and students in higher education skew liberal, particularly at four-year institutions. And debates over the value of college tend to revolve around four-year institutions.

Whatever the cause, a wide range of Republican voters are buying in to skepticism about higher education.

Younger Republicans tend to be much more positive, with 44 percent of 18- to 49-year-olds saying colleges have a positive effect on the way things are going in the country. And more than half (52 percent) of Republicans aged 18 to 29 view colleges positively.

Even so, the share of Republicans under 50 who have a positive view of higher education has fallen by a whopping 21 percentage points since 2015.

Likewise, positive views of colleges among Republicans who hold a college or graduate degree declined by 11 percentage points, from 44 percent to 33 percent, during the last two years. It dropped by 20 percentage points (from 57 percent to 37 percent) among Republicans who do not have a college degree.

Based on income levels, Republicans are less positive about higher education the more money they make. Just 31 percent of those who earn at least \$75,000 a year in family income view colleges positively, compared to 34 percent in the \$30,000 to \$74,999 range. And 46 percent of Republicans making less than \$30,000 gave higher education positive marks.

Democrats tend to view colleges positively, with the survey finding comparable majorities across age, education and income. However, Democrats have a different dynamic than Republicans when income is factored in, with wealthier respondents viewing higher education more positively than their lower-income peers.

The findings are both a wake-up call and an opportunity to ask better questions about conservatives' waning confidence in higher education, said Alison Kadlec, senior vice president and director of higher education and work force engagement for Public Agenda.

“Is the precipitous drop in conservative regard for postsecondary education reflecting a decline in confidence in higher education attainment as a sure path to socioeconomic mobility, or is this more about perceptions of ‘liberal bias’ in higher education among conservatives?” she said via email. “Are these attitudes more an expression of backlash against rising cost of college and student debt load, and the accompanying belief that colleges are businesses that care more about their bottom line than students (as we’ve found in our research), or is this about the rise of an emboldened anti-intellectualism in the wake of the last presidential election?”



New York Times Tackles MU Enrollment After Student Protests

By: Mark Reardon

Listen to the story: <http://mms.tveyes.com/PlaybackPortal.aspx?SavedEditID=aad08a17-ea90-4cf4-a26f-78de8af3d491>



2015 Student Protests Led to 35 Percent Decline in Freshman Enrollment

Watch the story: <http://mms.tveyes.com/PlaybackPortal.aspx?SavedEditID=b8de27d6-088e-4203-8f45-dfecf13dad6f>

T COLUMBIA DAILY TRIBUNE

University of Missouri seeking lobbyist to replace laid off staff

By Rudi Keller

A little more than a month after laying off everyone responsible for the University of Missouri's lobbying efforts, the university is advertising for a chief lobbyist.

The position, posted Thursday, seeks someone who can establish and build relationships with state and federal officials that will “advance the strategic objectives and operational goals of the University of Missouri System and its four campuses.”

On May 31, as part of \$101 million in budget cuts that eliminated 474 jobs, most of the employees of University Relations were laid off. The UM System office handled lobbying duties in Jefferson City and Washington, D.C., as well as public relations duties to speak with reporters and process records requests.

The public relations functions were merged with the MU News Bureau, the Columbia campus media relations team. At the end of the most recent Board of Curators meeting, President Mun Choi said he wanted to conduct a national search “to identify the best people to represent us and our interests and the interests of our students and our faculty at the legislature.”

Asked why the university fired people from a job they now want to fill with a payroll employee, UM System spokesman Christian Basi wrote that the previous job of leading University Relations required a combination of skills, in communications and government relations, but that the new job “is strictly focused on government relations.”

Before the cuts, Marty Oetting was the system's chief representative in Jefferson City at a salary of \$104,956. He worked for Steve Knorr, vice president of University Relations, who also had lobbying duties, with a salary of \$228,063. In the Washington, D.C., lobbying office, Sara Spreitzer was paid \$175,000 annually and Meghan Sanguinette was paid \$78,000.

Oetting was rehired shortly after the layoff to serve as interim campus chief of staff by interim Chancellor Garnett Stokes.

The university also has a contract to pay Statehouse Strategies LLC, a firm headed by Andy Blunt, son of U.S. Sen. Roy Blunt, R-Mo., \$10,500 a month for lobbying services. The contract,

extended for 18 months in December, expires June 30, 2018. University rules allow it to cancel vendor contracts when resources are tight, but no change has been made, Basi wrote.

The last two years have been exceptionally difficult for the university. In 2016, the UM System fought to avoid major state budget cuts after the campus protests that ousted then-President Tim Wolfe and created the political firestorm over the actions of then-Assistant Professor Melissa Click at the protest site and during the 2015 Homecoming parade.

This year, Gov. Eric Greitens withheld legislative appropriations of \$31.4 million for the year that ended June 30 and then withheld money from current fiscal year spending for core activities and cooperative programs.

The new lobbyist's main duties will be dealing with the legislative and executive branches of state government with some federal responsibilities. Whether the university will hire another employee for Washington duties or engage a contractor was uncertain, Choi said in June.

If the university hires a contract lobbyist for Washington, Choi said last month, it will be to help the university bring in high-profile research projects funded with federal money.

As of Monday, no decision had been made about federal lobbying and there is no timeline for making a decision, Basi wrote.

T COLUMBIA DAILY TRIBUNE

Law firm bills MU \$137K for leading probe into academic misconduct allegations

By **Blake Toppmeyer**

Missouri has amassed a six-digit bill since December from the law firm that's spearheading the university's investigation into former tutor Yolanda Kumar's allegations of academic misconduct within the athletic department.

The firm Bond, Schoeneck & King has issued six billings to Missouri that total \$137,427.78, according to records obtained by the Tribune via an open-records request. The university so far has paid four installments totaling \$113,301.58. The most recent billings, issued to the university in May and June, haven't been paid yet.

Missouri hired attorney Mike Glazier and his law firm Bond, Schoeneck & King in November to work in conjunction with the NCAA and lead the university's efforts in its investigation of Kumar's allegations. Glazier, who is based from his firm's Overland Park, Kan., office, is considered an expert at representing universities in NCAA cases. He previously guided Missouri

through its most recent investigation into violations committed by the men's basketball program, which resulted in MU self-imposing penalties in January 2016.

Kumar, who was a math tutor within the athletic department's Total Person Program until her November resignation, claims she cheated for athletes across several sports programs at the encouragement of academic coordinators.

An athletic department spokesman confirmed that the law firm's six billings issued beginning Dec. 2 are for its work in the ongoing investigation. Missouri athletic director Jim Sterk said on June 28 that Glazier remained on retainer and that the investigation will remain active until the NCAA notifies the university otherwise.

"I think" the NCAA has "gotten most of the information," Sterk said then, "but there's still maybe some information they're still trying to get."

Missouri announced on Nov. 22 that it had received allegations of potential academic rules violations committed by a former tutor. That came after Kumar posted a whistleblowing Facebook message that was obtained by the Tribune and other media outlets.

MISSOURIAN

Archival material among Lewis Hall flood damage

[GINA BALSTAD](#) 12 hrs ago

COLUMBIA — Most of the archival items damaged by water last weekend in MU's Lewis Hall were on the floor or directly beneath ceiling leaks.

A pipe burst late Friday or early Saturday on the eighth floor of Lewis Hall, 701 S. Fifth St., resulting in flooding that affected nearly every part of the building, according to previous Missourian reporting.

Damage estimates won't be available for some time, and water was still being drained from the building as of Monday morning, MU spokesman Christian Basi said in an email Monday. No one can work in the building, Basi said, but staff members have been allowed to collect their belongings. There is no timeline for when they will be able to return to the building for work.

The University Archives offices are on the seventh floor, but most of the storage is in the basement, which is temperature and climate-controlled, according to Anselm Huelsbergen, a technical service archivist. There are additional units in Clark Hall, which adjoins Lewis Hall. In total, 2,000 cubic feet of records are being stored in Lewis and Clark.

Archive material directly affected by water included paper records, photographs and negatives, 16mm film reels, a VHS tape, an audio cassette, a micro cassette and about 10 "non-unique," or replaceable, books. Any electronic, audio or visual equipment that had power supplies or anything similar on the floor were also affected.

Huelsbergen said most of the damage was to flooring, electronics, equipment and computers. However, a majority of archival materials are not in Lewis Hall and are stored in separate record centers.

"In terms of archival material that we have, there is, relatively speaking, very little damage," Huelsbergen said. "Most of our material is stored up, far enough off the floor that the water didn't affect it."

There are a few areas where water came through the ceiling that did affect archival materials. Huelsbergen said this included both "unique," or non-replaceable, and non-unique documents.

Also damaged were two or three boxes of appraised material, Huelsbergen said. This is material that is sent to the archives for examination to determine if it is significant enough to store. The materials damaged had been appraised and found to not be suitable for the archives.

Huelsbergen will contact the departments that owned the appraised material to see if they want to salvage those documents. Otherwise, they will be destroyed or recycled.

The main concern Huelsbergen has for the archives is potential mold damage to the material still in Lewis Hall.

“Our concern now is that we are still in the building and that it is hot and humid,” Huelsbergen said. “Those two together can cause mold outbreaks.”

Steps are being taken to preserve what was damaged.

“When I came in on Saturday, I was able to determine what had extensive moisture damage and was able to get those into freezers in Ellis Library,” Huelsbergen said.

Putting this material into freezers keeps it preserved properly. Later, the materials will be freeze-dried or thawed and put through drying techniques. This buys time for proper preservation.

Damaged photographs will be put between paper and weighted down to absorb moisture and prevent them from curling upward. Photographs cannot be put through the same freezing process because of how they are made.

Although a number couldn't be provided, Huelsbergen said some of the costs associated with damage to the archives include equipment, the process of freeze drying and preservation and replacement of books.

The University Archives are stored administrative, legal and historical records of MU and the University of Missouri system, which can be made available for research.

This isn't the first time Lewis Hall flooded. In 2015, there was a similar situation [with a pipe breaking on the eighth floor](#).

Huelsbergen said it is unclear if this will change plans to move the archives out of Lewis Hall. He said there is a desire to move the archives to Ellis Library when space is available.



Pipe bursts in Lewis Hall on MU's campus, causing damage

By: Marie Bowman

Watch the story: <http://mms.tveyes.com/PlaybackPortal.aspx?SavedEditID=239b1dcf-343a-41ff-b783-9a451882c27c>

COLUMBIA, Mo. - A pipe burst on the eighth floor sometime between Friday night and Saturday morning at Lewis Hall on MU's campus, according to MU's spokesman.

Damage was discovered by an employee on Saturday morning, who immediately contacted authorities. MU called in a contractor who worked all of Saturday, most of Sunday and was back again on Monday.

MU also had its own staff on site to work on the damage. All of the floors and nearly every portion of every floor was damaged.

Staff were let in this morning to get their items, but can't work in the building. There is no estimate on when they will be able to return to work in the building, and also no estimate on the cost of the damage. The building mainly houses the school of health professions.

MISSOURIAN

GUEST COMMENTARY: An ode to Frankie Minor

FAARIS AKREMI, 1 hr ago

The University of Missouri is in transition. Still reeling from protests about race and administrative unresponsiveness, confronting demographic realities in a state with fewer

high school graduates and a downward trend in out-of-state students, Mizzou must reimagine itself.

As tuition receipts have declined, belts have had to be tightened. And that trend has only accelerated as the state legislature and governor have slashed higher education budgets.

So it wasn't exactly surprising when I heard about a round of layoffs in the division of student affairs last week. But it was a shock to find that Frankie Minor, the longtime director of residential life, was on the list. Without taking a position on how UM System President Mun Choi and other administrators are leading the university, I feel it important to acknowledge what Mizzou loses with Frankie's departure.

Frankie has been a leader at the university for 23 years. In that time, he has quite literally changed the face of Mizzou. His work resulted in fundamental innovations, including the addition of "respect" and "responsibility" to the university's core values.

He saw the department through an era of radical growth, developing more than a dozen new and renovated residential buildings. He was also the brain behind Mizzou's Freshman Interest Group (FIG) program for first-year students, a nationally recognized model for first-year transition programs.

But Frankie's accomplishments on paper don't even begin to reach his real impact. As the chief administrator of a department with thousands of clients (or "residents") and hundreds of student employees, Frankie was never too good to get his hands a little dirty helping a student staff member with a project.

He was far from your typical aloof upper administrator. Whether through his efforts to learn every one of the hundreds of student staff member's name within their first month of employment or attending events in residence halls, Frankie was accessible and present. With him around, it was clear to all that Mizzou valued its students.

For many students, Frankie's interest in their wellbeing and success was the first time the agent of an institution of education or government had ever taken an interest in them. It is not hyperbolic to write that he embodied the institution's mission to "provide all Missourians the benefits of a world-class research university."

As one of my friends recently wrote, "No one at Mizzou had a greater impact on my college and professional experience than did Frankie." By nurturing, challenging and leading by example, Frankie empowered students to see themselves as worthy — of respect, responsibility, excellence and discovery. He taught us to dream bigger.

Two years removed from my time at Mizzou, I cannot speak with authority to the wisdom of the recent decision to restructure the division of student affairs and, in the process, dissolve Frankie's role. I know tough choices must be made, but I hope that administrators don't lose sight of the human values at the core Frankie's work.

I have no doubt that Mizzou will emerge from its trials a stronger, more innovative institution than ever before. But last week, I would have pointed to Frankie Minor as the premier example of the kind of leadership Mizzou needs to make a successful transition.

This week, I can only say on behalf of all the students whose lives he's touched: thank you, Frankie.

Faaris (Fares) Akremi graduated from the University of Missouri College of Arts and Science with degrees in political science and geography in May 2015. Fares is now a third-year law student at Stanford Law School.