WASHINGTON — University of Missouri system president Gary Forsee stirred up a ruckus on campus when he waded into the global controversy of climate change two weeks ago by declaring his opposition to legislation pending in Congress.

“We have grave concerns,” Forsee wrote in a letter to Missouri’s congressional delegation, asserting that the bills could force the university to pay between $5 million and $8 million up front and up to $2 million annually thereafter to generate electricity.

Congressional opponents and global warming deniers were thrilled that the head of a major Missouri institution and the former CEO of Sprint Nextel Corp. had leapt into the fray. Environmental advocates were peeved partly because Forsee had previously joined other academic heads in signing a pledge to combat climate change.

Given Forsee’s concerns, the House Energy and Commerce Committee decided to look into the University of Missouri’s situation and talk to its power plant managers. In a memo released late today, the committee concluded that Forsee had based his calculations on faulty premises.

The memo from committee chairman Henry Waxman, D-Calif., to Reps. Ike Skelton and Russ Carnahan, both Missouri Democrats, said that “it is evident that these estimates are inaccurate and significantly overstate the cost of the legislation ... “

Forsee’s first mistake, Waxman’s memo said, was believing that the University of Missouri would be subject to terms of the House-passed legislation as far as power plant pollution when in fact it would be exempted given the small amount of electricity it puts on the grid.

The letter notes that the legislation "exempts combustion devices that are part of cogeneration systems and that supply one-third or less of their electric output ... for sale."

About one-third of the potential costs Forsee worried about were due to his mistaken belief that the University would be covered by the legislation and therefore need to purchase emission allowances.
Next, the memo observed that in declaring his opposition, Forsee had estimated the wholesale cost of electricity and natural gas at a considerably higher price than either the Environmental Protection Agency, the Energy Information Administration or the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office have predicted.

Lastly, the memo said that Forsee’s estimates of a 50 percent hike in electricity rates also were much higher than the government has predicted. It pointed out that the EPA had predicted an 11 percent rate increase in 2015 without factoring in allowances that electricity consumers would be given — which would reduce the increases to less than 1 percent.

Committee analysts added that some of the high prices Forsee calculates appeared to be based on the projections that the university would be switching some of its fuel from coal to natural gas to meet terms of the legislation. The memo added that it knew of no projection suggesting the costs associated with switching fuel would be as high as Forsee believed.

Despite shooting down Forsee’s calculations, the committee made no predictions of its own on how much more the University of Missouri might be paying in total if cap-and-trade legislation pending in Congress wins approval.

Memo contradicts Forsee's cap-and-trade argument

By Janese Heavin

University of Missouri System President Gary Forsee’s recent letter to lawmakers opposing cap-and-trade legislation sparked both criticism and praise and drew national attention, but at the end of the day, the letter was based on inaccurate assumptions, according to a congressman’s memo.

Contrary to Forsee’s written concerns, MU’s power plant would not be a “covered entity” under the proposed legislation, according to a memo from U.S. Rep. Henry Waxman, chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee. The memo was sent to U.S. Reps. Ike Skelton and Russ Carnahan, both Missouri Democrats, to Forsee and to chancellors at all four UM System campuses. A copy was sent to the Tribune.

Forsee’s letter, sent to Missouri’s entire congressional delegation, expressed concern that cap-and-trade laws would cost the university between $5 million and $8 million during implementation. The numbers were based on Environmental Protection Agency and Energy Information Administration estimates and calculated based on the assumption MU would have to initially buy up to 30 percent of the greenhouse gas allowances, according to information from Paul Hoemann, director of university energy management.

But, Waxman wrote, one-third of the potential costs alleged in Forsee’s letter are based on the assumption that MU would need to buy allowances for its power plant.

“However, based on the information provided by the university power plant managers, the plant would not meet the definition of a covered entity under ACES, given the small amount of electricity it sells to the grid,” Waxman said. “The legislation exempts combustion devices that are part of cogeneration systems and that supply ‘one-third or less of [their] potential electric output capacity and 25 MW or less of electrical output for sale.’”

Additionally, the figures used to come up with Forsee’s numbers exceed actual federal estimates, therefore his costs were inflated, Waxman wrote.

A letter Skelton wrote to Forsee said, “I am dismayed at the timing of the letter” opposing the legislation “and am disappointed that it mischaracterizes federal legislation.”

Forsee spokeswoman Jennifer Hollingshead said she had not seen Waxman’s memo and could not comment. Forsee was not available for comment.

Forsee’s opposition to cap-and-trade legislation attracted more than 40 students, MU employees and community members to separate rallies outside of University Hall today. First, more than 30
students protested his letter, chanting "Forsee lacks foresight" and carrying signs declaring Forsee wants coal for Christmas and that he's failing MU like he failed as a Sprint executive.

"Gary Forsee needs to change his viewpoint or at least consult his campus before coming out with something so political the way he did," said protestor Tyler Hutcherson, a junior with the group Coal Free Mizzou.

Jan Weaver, director of MU's School of Natural Resources, told the crowd Forsee was only looking at the worst-case financial situation and not the worst-case scenario if pollutants aren't reduced. Weaver predicted significant ecological changes will hurt Missouri farming if climate changes aren't slowed.

"Failing to take action now is going to have some serious consequences for the state of Missouri," she said.

The afternoon protest was breaking up when about 10 MU Republicans showed up on the University Hall lot with signs thanking Forsee for keeping an eye on university finances.

If cap-and-trade legislation were to pass, MU would have to lower its quality of education or increase tuition to offset the costs, said Brett Dinkins, chair of the MU Republicans group.

Hollingshead said system administrators had no response to the rallies.

Reach Janese Heavin at 573-815-1705 or e-mail jheavin@columbiatribune.com.
Students, faculty have mixed opinions of Forsee letter

By Matthew Reinig, Hayley Tsukayama

December 3, 2009 | 10:13 p.m. CST

Mandy Sutherland leads a chant, “Forsee lacks foresight,” during a protest against University of Missouri System President Gary Forsee’s stance on cap and trade legislation. Forsee sent a letter earlier this week in opposition to federal climate change legislation. Protesters demonstrated on Thursday outside of University Hall. | Charles Ludeke

COLUMBIA — Students and faculty voiced both support and opposition Thursday to a letter UM System President Gary Forsee wrote Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer urging him to oppose two "Clean Energy" bills.

The letter was written in November and opposed a House resolution and a Senate bill because they would have a "detrimental impact" on the University of Missouri System.
In the letter, Forsee cited concerns the legislation could cost the university between $5 million and $8 million. Some critics have said this contradicts Forsee's previous support of the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment petition.

According to a document provided by MU spokeswoman Mary Jo Banken, these figures were generated based on information from the Energy Information Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency. The university's worst-case scenario projected the legislation could cost the school $6.7 million, with a 20 percent margin of error.

"We urge you to oppose these bills or ensure that specific exemptions are included," Forsee wrote in his letter.

About 35 protesters gathered outside University Hall, where the system offices are located, in opposition to Forsee's stance on the legislation.

"He ... used the word 'we,'" said MU junior Tyler Hutcherson, a member of Coal Free Mizzou who disagrees with Forsee. "I'm definitely not a part of that 'we.'"

Jan Weaver, director of MU's Environmental Studies program, said MU has an important role to play in making the state more carbon-neutral.

Weaver said Forsee raised legitimate concerns about the budget in his letter, but she does not think the university should base its actions on a worst-case scenario.

"It would be reasonable to ask for a best-case scenario as well," she said.

About 10 MU students who support Forsee's stance on the legislation counter-protested, citing concerns that the proposed bill could ultimately increase students' tuition.

"We're not like anti-environment, it's just ... the cost far outweighs the benefits with this bill," MU senior Eric Hobbs said. "The university is a business, and they're not just going to take a hit in profits."

Gov. Jay Nixon announced in January a budget agreement for fiscal year 2010 under which Missouri students would be protected from tuition increases, and higher education institutions would receive necessary funding, according to the governor's Web site. He proposed last month to freeze tuition again.
Nixon's office could not be reached for comment.

MU sophomore Megan Roberts, who agrees with Forsee's stance, said she would like to see an economic model implemented that rewards companies for lowering carbon dioxide output as opposed to legislation that forces them to.

"I believe we should give tax credits to companies that invest in alternative energy research," she said.

One piece of energy legislation, House Resolution 2454, or the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009, passed the House in June and is awaiting a Senate vote.

According to a bill summary by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the legislation currently includes the following measures:

- Require electric utilities to satisfy 20 percent of their electricity demand through renewable energy sources and energy efficiency by 2020.
- Invest in clean energy technologies and energy efficiency, including $90 billion in renewable energy and energy efficiency, $20 billion in electric vehicles and other advanced technologies, $60 billion in carbon capture and sequestration, as well as $20 billion in "basic" research and development.
- Reduce carbon dioxide emissions from major U.S. sources by 17 percent by 2020.

According to the Committee on Energy and Commerce's summary, citing the Congressional Budget Office, the legislation is calculated to cost the average household less than 50 cents per day.
Students divided on Forsee letter

Forsee said cap and trade too costly for MU in a letter to lawmakers.

By Megan Donohue and Victoria Guida
Published Dec. 4, 2009

Groups of opposing protests met Thursday outside of University Hall to support or contest UM system President Gary Forsee's recent letter opposing cap and trade legislation.

The bill, which has passed the U.S. House of Representatives, aims to curb greenhouse gas emissions nationally.

Campus groups, such as Coal Free Mizzou, Greeks Going Green and MU College Democrats, joined with national campaigns, such as Clean Energy Works and Repower America, which officially supported the gathering, to protest against the letter before marching to Speakers Circle.

A little earlier, a group of roughly 20 MU College Republican members and other like-minded students met at Speakers Circle then traveled together to University Hall in a counter-protest to show Forsee they support his decision.

In the letter to federal lawmakers, Forsee said he opposed the legislation on financial grounds.

"As currently written, we have grave concerns and oppose this legislation for the detrimental impact it will have on the University of Missouri System," Forsee said in the letter. "The proposed cap and trade model will significantly increase the energy expenditures for all four of our campuses."

Forsee said the energy budget for MU is $13 million, and the new requirements would cost $5 to $8 million initially and $1 to $2 million every year after that.

"Given the impact of such unsustainable increases on the University's already hard-pressed budget, we urge you to oppose these bills or ensure that specific exemptions are included," Forsee said in the letter.

MU College Republicans Chairman Brett Dinkins said those costs are going to be passed onto students.

"What we were trying to focus on today is that the cap and trade bill will lower the quality of the education that we are receiving or raise the price that we are paying," Dinkins said. "They are going to have to do something to get that money and it will be coming straight out of our pockets through tuition."

Forsee's use of the word "we" has drawn criticism and Tyler Hutcherson, Coal Free Mizzou events and grassroots coordinator, said it has a lot of people upset.

"I hope to get across the message that when Gary Forsee writes letters and uses the term 'we,' he should actually consult with the people involved before he writes these letters because I personally don't agree with what he said at all," Hutcherson said.

MU College Republicans member Chelsea Maltagliati said the "we" in dispute is not so out of line.
"We were out there to show President Forsee that we support his decision," Maltagliati said. "It was just create a tuition hike and no one can afford that now with the way the economy is going."

The groups that gathered to protest the letter hope their demonstration will remind Forsee to hold to the promise he made when he signed the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment, Campuses Beyond Coal Organizer Ryan Doyle said.

The American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment is a network of presidents who are leading their institutions to drastically reduce greenhouse gas emissions on their campuses, spokeswoman Gina Coplon-Newfield said. The commitment also deals with teaching students to address climate change upon graduation.

Maltagliati said there are other ways to reduce carbon emission, and perhaps more appropriate times to do so as well, and disagreed that the letter went against the commitment.

"I don't think it's against the climate idea, it's basically against cap and trade which is a horrible bill in what it will do to this country," Maltagliati said.

Maria Speiser, spokeswoman for Sen. Claire McCaskill, D-Mo., said the bill is in its early stages in the legislative process, and significant changes will likely be made before it comes to a vote.

"At this point, (McCaskill's) focus remains on ensuring that costs aren't unfairly passed onto Missourians, including its public universities," Speiser said. "As far as the letter goes, she always welcomes input from constituents."

Columbia's U.S. House Rep. Blaine Luetkemeyer, a Republican, has come out in support of Forsee's letter, his spokesman Paul Sloca said. Luetkemeyer voted against the cap and trade bill in the House.

"It's going to cost the university, and therefore cost students and their parents more to implement this cap and trade legislation," Sloca said. "That's a very, very sound argument, and it's an argument that Blaine has been making for months."

MU Chancellor Brady Deaton was unaware of Forsee's letter, MU News Bureau Executive Director Mary Jo Banken said.

"He thinks that this national energy policy requires ongoing discussion and thorough scrutiny," Banken said. "We have been in discussions with our students about MU's use of energy and the implications of our energy consumption."

Banken said MU is installing a new biomass-fired boiler that will eventually reduce coal use by up to 25 percent.

"We take this important national issue very seriously and will continue our work to reduce energy consumption and develop solutions to the energy crisis," Banken said.
COLUMN: Presidents Obama, Forsee traveling down wrong paths

By George Kennedy
December 3, 2009 | 4:25 p.m. CST

Both of my presidents in the past few days have made policy announcements I'm afraid they, and we, will live to regret.

Barack Obama's decision to send another 30,000 troops to Afghanistan puts at risk thousands more lives and billions more dollars. Gary Forsee's decision to urge our congressional delegation to oppose cap-and-trade legislation puts at risk a policy that's crucial in combating climate change.

A headline in Thursday's New York Times announced that Mr. Obama's speech at West Point “wins over some skeptics.” I watched the speech hoping to be won over, but I wasn't.

Let me be clear — as President Obama himself might say, and indeed did say several times Tuesday night. I’m a strong Obama supporter. I voted for him, and I think he's a smart and thoughtful guy trying hard to do the right things with all the difficult issues he faces. Most of his decisions I agree with. On this one, though, I'm still a skeptic.

If you haven't read Nick Kristof's column, also in Thursday's Times, you should. He's a writer who walks the ground in the dangerous corners of the world he opines about, from Afghanistan to Darfur. I share his conclusion:

"My hunch is that if Mr. Obama wants success in Afghanistan, he would be far better off with 30,000 more schools than 30,000 more troops. Instead, he's embarking on a buildup that may become an albatross on his presidency."

He quotes Greg Mortenson, the “Three Cups of Tea” author who actually builds such schools in both Afghanistan and Pakistan, as saying that the Afghans themselves “want schools, health facilities, but not necessarily more physical troops.”
To be fair, Mr. Obama took pains Tuesday to stress the difficulties and uncertainties that abound in the land that defeated two previous world powers, Great Britain and Russia. He clearly understands, as he said, that there are no perfect choices, no sure things. I thought he made the best case that could be made for the policy he has chosen.

His enemies on the right — and I think most of them really are enemies and not just critics — are attacking him for all the wrong reasons. The problem isn't the time he took weighing unattractive options or the timeline he announced. The problem is that, to him and his advisers, Afghanistan looks like a nail. So they're reaching for a bigger hammer.

Instead, it seems to me that the situation there more closely resembles one of those Improvised Explosive Devices that plague our troops. The more force that's applied, the greater the likelihood it'll blow up in our faces.

Of course, I could be wrong. Mr. Obama is certainly acting on the best advice he could get from the most knowledgeable experts.

That's not so clear, at least not yet, about President Forsee's decision. As I write, we just don't know who, if anybody, was consulted. We do know that Chancellor Brady Deaton wasn't. I've seen no evidence that any of the university's scientists or economists were.

We also know that economists from Nobel winner Paul Krugman on the left to the staff of the Economist magazine on the right agree that cap-and-trade or a more straightforward carbon tax is essential if we are to reduce the carbon dioxide emissions that nearly all climate scientists hold largely responsible for global warming.

President Forsee complained of the costs that could be imposed on our coal-burning university. I wish that, instead, he had publicly pledged to move as fast as possible to switch to less toxic sources of heat and power. Actually, in an earlier statement shared with other university presidents, he appeared to do something close to that.

Both presidents, I'm confident, are leading to the best of their considerable ability. I just wish they were headed in a different direction.

George Kennedy is a former managing editor at the Missourian and professor emeritus at the Missouri School of Journalism.
Editorial:

Forsee's letter should be on behalf of UM system

Published Dec. 4, 2009

UM system President Gary Forsee had no right to write a letter about cap and trade legislation on behalf of the UM system without consulting key members of the administration first.

"We have grave concerns and oppose this legislation for the detrimental impact it will have on the University of Missouri System," Forsee said in his letter.

Who is "we?"

When contacted Thursday about the letter, MU spokeswoman Mary Jo Banken said Chancellor Brady Deaton was "unaware" of the letter, so clearly the MU chancellor was not contacted.

In addition, it appears the Board of Curators wasn't contacted. As the governing body of the UM system, it's important to contact the board before sending a letter like this.

Perhaps other chancellors or university officials were contacted, but Deaton and the Board of Curators should have been also. With politicians and the student body so divided on this complex issue, Forsee should not be acting on his own.

We realize, as Forsee said, this letter is addressing the financial problem cap and trade could potentially cause for the UM system. The estimated $5 to $8 million initial cost and $1 to $2 million cost every year thereafter is a large bill in addition to the $13 million we already pay in energy costs at MU.

However, sending this on his own could make it look like Forsee has a political agenda and not a fiscal one.

The point of cap and trade is to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the U.S., and as Forsee cites, the UM system is making leaps in sustainability, but opposing sustainability legislation accomplishes nothing in that direction. This letter could also affect MU's sustainability grants, which students have worked hard to gain.

Earlier, Forsee signed the American College and University President's Climate Commitment. He signed a commitment to eliminate global warming emissions but also signed a letter asking to oppose the American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009.

Wait, what? He signed documents saying completely opposite things?

The issue we have with Forsee's letter is not about his stance on cap and trade legislation. It's the blatant disregard to a previously signed commitment and the disrespect to all those he represents.
Letter to the Editor:

Forsee's letter makes sense financially

By Brett Dinkins, sophomore
Published Dec. 4, 2009

Thank You President Forsee.

I feel it necessary to write in and express my gratitude toward President Forsee, and the university, in offering their stance against the Cap and Trade legislation. Our University is viewed highly among other universities in our efforts to use clean and affordable energy. It is an honor to be at a university that puts the needs of their students first. Our power plant is one of the cleanest in the nation, running for the most part, on clean coal.

Environmental extremists would have you believe that there is no such thing as clean coal energy, but that is simply not true. We need coal plants in America to keep energy costs low, and American jobs available. If this legislation would pass, the university would be faced with two options.

1. They would be forced to lower the quality of education we are receiving due to the increased cost in keeping our campus "environmentally friendly."
2. The university would be forced to raise the cost of tuition to meet the expenses forced by the Cap and Trade Legislation. Again, I commend President Forsee and the university in their efforts to provide us affordable, high quality education. Even more, I look forward to Governor Nixon voicing his stance against this legislation, to keep to his promise of not raising our tuition cost.
University of Missouri pledges to enroll and graduate more low-income and minority students as part of nationwide initiative

By Kavita Kumar
St. Louis Post-Dispatch

The University of Missouri system has teamed up with a nationwide initiative to reduce the gap in the college-going and graduation rate of low-income and students of color.

The Access to Success Initiative has set an ambitious deadline and goal — to cut the gaps in half by 2015.

During a conference call today, the Education Trust and university leaders unveiled the data from a baseline report that make up the first major step in this process. The benchmarking data shows that the University of Missouri's four campuses are doing well in some areas, but not so well in others.

One of the largest gaps UM has is in the percentage of low-income students who enter the university as freshmen. Whereas 41 percent of the state's high school graduating class were low-income, only 16 percent of UM's incoming freshmen were low-income in 2004-05. That is a 25 percent gap. If the university halved that gap, as the initiative calls for by 2015, then another 901 low-income students would have entered as freshmen that year.

The university also has some sizeable gaps — between 14 and 16 percent — in the graduation rates of low-income students who start as freshmen and in the graduation rates of minority students.

"We do have work to be done," said Deborah Noble-Triplett, the system's assistant vice president for academic affairs.

But there is some good news, too. The university has no gap in the percentage of minority transfer students who enter the university or in the graduation rates of low-income transfer students. In these areas, the university wants to maintain its success, Noble-Triplett said.

But in the areas where the campuses need to improve, the university plans to better monitor some of its current recruitment and retention pieces aimed at low-income and minority students to see how well those programs are working, she said.
One of those strategies include grouping students into learning communities. Another is to make sure students have enough academic support to make it through core math and science classes such as calculus, so they don’t drop out in frustration, she said.

Noble-Triplett said she hopes being part of this initiative will give the university a chance to learn about and perhaps replicate other strategies being used at other universities around the country.

The initiative includes 24 university systems, which collectively educate almost 40 percent of undergraduates attending public four-year colleges in the U.S.

Kati Haycock, president of the Education Trust, noted that these universities voluntarily signed onto this initiative without any pressure or mandates from the federal government or from their states.

“They did this because they thought they could do better — and our states and the country will be the better for it,” she said.

And she noted, these universities could have dropped out as large budget cuts have ravaged many university systems around the country in the last year or so. But none of them have so far.

The Grade is the St. Louis region’s premier blog on education and child welfare. To read other recent posts, go to www.stltoday.com/thegrade.

Tags: Access to Success Initiative, baseline report, data, Deborah Noble-Triplett, Education Trust, gap, Higher education, Kavita Kumar, low-income students, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, students of color, university systems
Aspirin, Tylenol could impact flu vaccines
Published: Dec. 3, 2009 at 10:18 AM

COLUMBIA, Mo., Dec. 3 (UPI) -- Over-the-counter drugs, such as aspirin and Tylenol, that inhibit certain enzymes could impact the effectiveness of vaccines, U.S. researchers said.

"If you're taking aspirin regularly, which many people do for cardiovascular treatment, or acetaminophen (Tylenol) for pain and fever and get a flu shot, there is a good chance that you won't have a good antibody response," Charles Brown of the University of Missouri said in a statement.

"These drugs block the enzyme COX-1, which works in tissues throughout the body. We have found that if you block COX-1, you might be decreasing the amount of antibodies your body is producing, and you need high amounts of antibodies to be protected."

COX enzymes play important roles in the regulation of the immune system, but the role of these enzymes is not yet understood completely, and medications that inhibit them may have adverse side effects, the researchers said.

Arthritis, cardiovascular disease and diabetes are all chronic inflammatory diseases, but inflammation also helps protect individuals from infection, Brown said.

Brown and colleagues tested the drugs on an animal model and have found that these non-steroidal drugs do inhibit vaccines, but the next step is to test it on humans.

The findings were published in The Journal of Immunology.

© 2009 United Press International, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
Autopsy performed on I-70 crash victim

Thursday, December 3, 2009

The death of former engineering professor and inventor Henry Liu was listed as resulting from “deceleration injuries” suffered when his vehicle veered off Interstate 70 and hit a tree Tuesday, according to an autopsy performed yesterday at the Boone County Medical Examiner’s office.

Because of the extensive damage to Liu’s organs caused by the blunt-force trauma and the fire that engulfed the vehicle, it was impossible to determine whether a heart attack or some other medical emergency preceded the crash.

A co-worker said that at 1:45 p.m. Tuesday, Liu had been returning to Columbia from a business meeting in St. Louis. Capt. Eric Hartman of the Columbia Fire Department said Liu’s Toyota sport utility vehicle veered off I-70 west of the Lake of the Woods exit, hit a tree and burst into flames. It took firefighters about 10 minutes to extinguish the fire.

Liu, 73, was a world-renowned expert in pipeline technology used to transport freight and had developed a “green brick” made of fly ash. He had recently won a $100,000 “Purpose Prize” given to people in their second careers.
MU is attempting to save students money on textbooks, but the University Bookstore is concerned about relaying the different options to students.

The Missouri Students Association's Academic Affairs committee is looking to perform a "textbook blitz" to begin mass advertisement of the rebate and rental programs the University Bookstore offers. The textbook savings are new to MU as of this semester.

MSA passed two bills acknowledging the new rental program at MU and announced MSA will put out flyers and utilize other modes of communication to inform students about the rebate program.

"Despite the efforts of the bookstore in alerting students to the rebate opportunity, many students, especially new freshmen, do not know of the rebate opportunity," the resolution on the University Bookstore's Textbook Rebate stated.

The rebates give the student a voucher for 5 percent of all the books purchased.

"One of the more popular methods that has come into vogue recently is the textbook rental program," Academic Affairs Committee Chairman Ian Krause said. "It's quite a considerable amount of savings when you come down to it."

Student Auxiliary Services spokeswoman Michelle Froese suggested looking to the new options under used books. The newest option to MU is the rental program.

"It's a pilot and limited to a few titles," Froese said. "There are about 50 titles under guaranteed buyback, a third option is special pricing on certain used titles because some of these editions are very old and we want to make that price better for students."

The rental program is facing opposition from professors who do not want to commit to the same book for multiple years in a row, Froese said. This issue applies to certain subject areas in constant development where new and better books have the potential to be published.

Some used books could receive new pricing. Publishers set new prices on textbooks and then establish used prices based off of the price new ones, Froese said.

The guaranteed buyback program offers to buy back the used books from students at the end of the semester.

"The book has to be readopted by the university for the next semester," Froese said. "For example, 'Rock Recall,' for the music appreciation class, has a new price of $124.55 and the guaranteed buyback price on the sticker will say $62.25."
Another example Froese said was "Exploring Psychology" which has a new price of $84.55, and if it's going to be used again it will be $42.25. The information will be on a colored sticker on the cover of the book.

There are 800 titles listed on the buyback list for next semester, but the number is subject to change as professors submit their course requirements.

E-books have been steadily increasing in price in response to the high demand for books online, Froese said. The University Bookstore is also checking into Espresso Book Machine printing, which prints public domain books and can sell them for around $2 instead of the usual $10 for a book.

"The options are complicated, so communicating the special pricing is difficult," Froese said.
J school reflects on use of new requirement

Debate still centers on the relevance of the requirement.

By Jared Grafman
Published Dec. 4, 2009

The School of Journalism plans to continue its trial run of requiring freshman journalism students to have a Web-enabled audio-video player through next year's incoming freshman class, said Brian Brooks, associate dean for undergraduate studies at the school.

Brooks said there is still some confusion about the requirement in regard to iPod touches and iPhones.

"It is not a requirement for students to have an iTouch or an iPhone but rather a device with the ability to play video and audio files and access the Web," Brooks said.

Although the J School doesn't specify which brand of Web-enabled audio-video player is required, its Web site states the "requirement is best met by purchasing the Apple iPod touch."

Brooks said the new technology requirement has been successfully integrated into the Career Explorations in Journalism course, despite a shaky start to the semester.

"I think we bit off more than we could chew at the beginning of this semester, but everything's pretty much smooth now," Brooks said. "We had a lot of problems at the start of the semester getting students logged in, but we fixed them."

Professors implemented new curricula specifically for the Web-enabled audio-video players.

"We used an electronic textbook for the Journalism 1010 class and videos that could be viewed on the iTouch," Brooks said.

There are also additional videos available of guest lecturers that were not able to speak to the class due to the limited time of the course.

"The additional videos allow students who are interested in learning more about a specific journalism specialization to watch the videos easily and conveniently," Brooks said.

In addition to the electronic textbook and iTunes U videos, there is software being developed for the devices' use in classrooms.

"We're working on an app for the iTouch and iPhone that will help freshmen acclimate with MU that will help with the common questions most freshmen have when coming to college," Brooks said.

A map for students to navigate campus will be among its features.

The new technology requirement has caused mixed reactions from freshmen students taking the introductory journalism course.
Freshman Felicia Greiff said she was not happy with the new requirement and has yet to use it in her class.

"I think the iTouch is pointless for the class and it's just another way for MU to incorporate Apple into their system," Greiff said.

Freshman Elise Oggioni said she found the device useful but didn't think it should be a requirement.

"The best part to having the iTouch for the class was being able to see what we were doing from day to day," Oggioni said. "It was a really big help in preparing for the class."

Brooks said the administration might consider changing the requirement to fit changing technology.

"We are not sure about a long term commitment because of the pace that new technology is made available," Brooks said. "For example, there is a rumor that Apple is coming out with a new tablet in the new year."
Tiger Spot still in disrepair

The spot has more wear and tear, despite being covered for two years.

By Rachel Krause
Published Dec. 4, 2009

Despite more than two years covered by a tarp, the 700-square-foot mosaic Tiger Spot located outside Ellis Library continues to fall into further disrepair without a solution in sight.

MSA Senate Speaker Amanda Shelton said any work on Tiger Spot has been put on hold due to complicated artists’ copyright issues that have plagued the mosaic piece since discussions of moving or repairing the piece began.

"After speaking with (Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Cathy) Scroggs and other individuals inside and outside MSA, it came to my attention that there are somewhat complex legal issues that are causing problems with fixing or removing the mosaic, because it was an artwork created by someone and is governed by intellectual property laws," Shelton said in an e-mail. "As a result, we have decided to put this project on hold to address more time-sensitive issues for students, but we will remain cognizant of the situation."

Constructed by artist Paul Jackson, Tiger Spot was originally made up of 300,000 1.5-by-1 centimeter Italian glass tiles. The mosaic piece was unveiled during Homecoming Week 2001, and within a year the piece began to break apart due to foot traffic, weather, vandalism and, as some argued, poor construction.

Repairs to 10 parts of the mosaic piece were first made in October 2002 and $11,000 was spent on a new drainage system beneath Lowry Mall to prevent further water damage in 2005. In August 2007, Tiger Spot was covered by a tarp purchased by Student and Auxiliary Services and cost between $1,500 and $2,000, said MU Libraries spokeswoman Shannon Carey in a previous Maneater report.

Scroggs said she has attended chancellor's staff meetings on the issue but has not been particularly active in the issue of Tiger Spot. Scroggs said artists' copyright laws have been one of the obstacles to repairing or moving Tiger Spot.

"We had some kind of agreement with the artist, and if we're not going to keep it there then the artist may be able to take legal action against the university," Scroggs said.

There has also been confusion as to who is directly responsible for resolving the issue. MU Libraries Director Jim Cogswell said the libraries were not extensively involved in Tiger Spot decisions.

"Even though the Tiger Spot is directly outside the north door of Ellis Library, it is not part of the library’s domain," Cogswell said. "We have no decision to be made by the library affecting that particular part of the campus."

Scroggs speculates financial responsibility for the repairs might be an issue. She said if the university were willing to pay for the restoration costs, maybe Jackson would repair the mosaic.
Cogswell, like many members of the campus community, remains uninformed about the state of Tiger Spot.

"All I know is that for less than a year it was a viable and quite lovely piece of artwork and for whatever reasons, it started to disintegrate," Cogswell said. "Everyone's been pointing fingers at one another on who's to blame for that. Instead what we need to do is get some sort of resolution and it really has to be agreed upon by all the parties, and that is the problem."

Both Cogswell and Scroggs said Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services Jackie Jones is in charge of campus facilities and would know more about the status of Tiger Spot. Jones could not be reached for comment.
Students should get involved with budget

By Erica Zucco
Published Dec. 4, 2009

Before Thanksgiving break, CNN ran headline after headline about University of California students protesting raised costs for higher education. Students protested outside the budget vote confirming a 32-percent hike in undergraduate tuition fees. Their voices were heard, and they made a splash, media-wise, but they'll still be paying $585 more in January and another $1,344 next fall.

Around the same time, MU students got some news: Gov. Jay Nixon and university system presidents agreed to cut budgets in exchange for freezing in-state tuition for the next academic year. The announcement secured little comfort for graduate and out-of-state students, but it was better news than what coastal students heard.

Student leaders have an awesome opportunity to put their organizational skills to work by bringing students together to address what we're paying and see if there are possible ways to save. Administrators are open to student input -- we just have to make the effort. Let's get finance students involved at looking through budgets. Let's make tuition adjustment a key goal of the Missouri Students Association's new legislative program and of the Associated Students of the University of Missouri's agenda. Let's bring students together to do what they do best, whether it be researching, analyzing or communicating. It was awesome to see students come together to lobby Access Missouri — let's continue that energy.

Be conscientious about what you're willing to pay outside of the classroom. You can get internship credit from involvement with a variety of on-campus organizations and activities. If you're going to be involved in any on-campus activity that can offer you academic credit, be sure to think about both sides. Every hour you spend doing an activity is an hour you can't spend academically, so if you aren't going to get paid you might as well get academic credit for your work.

Every credit hour you attribute to that internship is one you can't use on another class, one that could also prepare you for your chosen career. As someone who has taken 18 credit hours each semester on top of student involvement, career preparation and a job, I know it isn't always feasible to work with something time-intensive, but if you can make it work, consider it.

In most departments, you'll still be paying for that credit — so why not get the internship/involvement experience for free and use the money on another class, whether it be a personal finance course or something directly related to your major?

Take use of what you are paying by going to class regularly. I remember my first day in the residence halls freshman year. There was a bright red bulletin board outside the elevators breaking down the cost of tuition to a day of class and showing how much money you waste by skipping a day or week's worth of classes. I don't remember the exact number, but it wasn't small change. No doubt you'll miss a day here or there, but be sure to sign up for classes you want to take so you aren't tempted to skip often. If you think of every class period as a seminar in a subject you care about, you'll want to go. Realize education is an investment in your future, as cliché as that might sound. And remember you get what you pay for — but not if you throw it away.
Breaking down national tuition, fee increases

Although MU tuition is frozen, fees increase for 2010-2011 academic year.

By Catherine Rolfe  
Published Dec. 4, 2009

"Shame on you, shame on you," California college students protested and chanted at UCLA this month, reacting to a 32 percent increase in their student fees.

Although other college students might not be protesting as loudly, the University of California system fee hike is part of a larger national trend. Undergraduate student fees and tuition increased an average of 6.3 percent nationally in the last academic year. In the last four years, fees and tuition have increased an average of 29 percent.

Compared to the national 29 percent increase, MU tuition and required student fees hit below the average percentage change during the last four years, coming in at 19.3 percent.

MU students haven't been affected as hard as other universities, but they've still been affected. There's no telling whether these continued increases would subside with the economy now faring better.

Gov. Jay Nixon’s agreement with major Missouri school leaders secured Missouri college tuition will again be frozen for the 2010-2011 academic year. This means students will pay the same tuition as they would have during the 2008-2009 academic year, after which the freeze was first implemented.

Students might still see some change in the amount of money they pay for school. The freeze affects tuition but not student fees or room and board.

Although about a third of students pay room and board for on-campus housing, all students are required to pay student fees.

Student fees are part of all students' bills from MU. They cover a variety of campus facilities and services, including the Student Recreation Complex and MizzouWireless. Fees are determined and approved by a variety of administrative bodies, but a student group actually holds the most influence over initiating the process.

The Student Fee Review Committee is composed of both graduate and undergraduate students and has the power to start the process of increasing, decreasing or creating any student fee.

SFRC Vice Chairman Matt Sheppard said the group members act as representatives for their peers.

"The university can’t really go to every single student," Sheppard said. "So they come to our committee, made up of students who are fairly involved and have a really good idea of what’s going on, and we can kind of speak up for the entire student body."

One integral part of the idea of student fees is everyone pays for everything. MSA Vice President Colleen Hoffmann said the student fee is beneficial in this way.
"Depending on the kind of student you are, the kind of things you're involved in, you might see more benefit from one area personally," Hoffmann said.

Regardless of whether a student goes to the Student Recreation Complex 10 times a week or has never stepped foot in the building, he or she pays the same amount of money for it.

"The combination of those fees allows one student to use the Student Recreation Complex and someone else to go to a different activity or utilize a different service," MU spokesman Christian Basi said. "It allows everyone to participate in the activities of their choices. Without those fees, we would not be able to have any of these activities or services."