Tornado, flooding lead to ed cuts in Missouri

By DAVID A. LIEB

Missouri's governor cut funding for education and other programs Friday to help offset the mounting tab from a disastrous spring in which a deadly tornado and widespread flooding destroyed thousands of homes, businesses and farms.

Gov. Jay Nixon announced $172 million in cuts from the budget that will take effect July 1, including reductions in aid to colleges and universities, student scholarships and busing for public elementary and secondary schools.

Lawmakers passed a more than $23 billion budget in early May, just days after the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers blew up a southeastern Missouri levee and unleashed a swollen Mississippi River on an estimated 130,000 acres of fertile farmland and rural homes. A couple of weeks later, the nation's deadliest tornado in decades tore through Joplin, destroying more than 8,000 homes and businesses. The death toll has risen to 151 people.

Nixon has committed $50 million in general revenues to the disaster response and recovery efforts, but that expense wasn't included in the budget. To make up for it, he cut $57 million from other parts of the budget. Nixon said the disaster aid must be a priority.

"When tornadoes hit, when floods hit, the state has a vital role to help recover and rebuild communities," Nixon told The Associated Press while in St. Louis to sign legislation reauthorizing a prescription drug subsidy for seniors and the disabled. That program escaped the budget cuts.

The largest reduction in state general revenues -- $16.8 million -- will come from the operating budgets of public colleges and universities. The result is that most institutions will receive a 7 percent funding cut next school year instead of the 5.5 percent reduction originally approved by lawmakers. The University of Missouri system and Missouri Western State University will get an 8 percent cut, because they have backed tuition increases larger than what the governor believed was appropriate, said Nixon's budget director, Linda Luebbering.

Missouri Southern State University, located in Joplin, also has backed a tuition increase that's more than Nixon would like. But Luebbering said Nixon decided not to cut more of its funding.
because of the tragedy the community has experienced. Missouri Southern has served as a staging area for some of the tornado recovery efforts.

Brian Long, director of the Council on Public Higher Education in Missouri, said Nixon's cut to universities was disappointing but not too surprising, because the governor had proposed a 7 percent cut when he outlined his budget plan in January.

"The (university) presidents are realists and keenly understand what it takes to balance a budget," Long said. But as a result of the state cut, "every institution will have to dig a little deeper to balance their own budgets in the coming year."

The governor's cuts include $8 million from the nearly $108 million that lawmakers had allotted for school busing aid. Luebbering said that reduction was necessary because Missouri Lottery proceeds for education aren't likely to meet budget expectations.

Before the nation's economic downturn began, schools had been getting $168 million annually to help subsidize busing, said Roger Kurtz, executive director at Missouri Association of School Administrators. He called Nixon's cut "a little disconcerting," but added that he appreciates that it came before the school year started so administrators could plan accordingly.

Nixon's $172 million in budget cuts also include a continued freeze of $100 million for construction projects at public colleges and universities. That money was supposed to be transferred to the state from the Missouri Higher Education Loan Authority, but the transfer has been on hold for a couple of years because economic conditions and changes in federal student loan laws have put pressure on the agency's finances. It was included in the upcoming budget because lawmakers wanted to confirm they expect the work will be done someday.
Nixon targets UM for bigger budget cut

By Rudi Keller

Columbia Daily Tribune Published June 10, 2011 at 3:17 p.m.

Updated June 11, 2011 at 2 a.m.

JEFFERSON CITY — Angering Gov. Jay Nixon apparently has its price, and yesterday the University of Missouri learned what that cost is. Cuts to the system budget will be steeper than for almost every other state college.

Nixon announced he will balance the state budget for the coming year in part by rejecting the attempt by lawmakers to mitigate his 7 percent cut to colleges and universities. And because the UM Board of Curators increased tuition and fees by an average of 5.5 percent, the university will be cut 8.1 percent.

Overall, Nixon will withhold $57.1 million from the $7.9 billion general revenue portion of the budget. By withholding instead of vetoing, Nixon could release some of the money later if state revenues improve.

Nixon said he had to make cuts because lawmakers passed a budget that was out of balance and the state needs money to pay for flood and tornado recovery. Nixon has set aside $25 million for southeast Missouri flooding and $25 million tornado recovery in Joplin. A brightening revenue picture has helped close the gap, he noted.

Of the $57.1 million, $16.8 million came from higher education spending. Nixon cut another $115.1 million from other state funds, but $99.7 million was for unfunded construction projects. More than half of the remainder came from an $8 million cut in funding for school transportation.

Only Missouri Western State University, which increased tuition 9.5 percent, received a steeper cut at 8.2 percent.

“They chose to access additional tuition revenues that the other institutions did not choose to use,” Nixon said of UM and Missouri Western.

The decision to cut UM deeper than other schools followed Nixon’s criticism in January when the curators approved an average 5.5 percent increase in tuition and fees for the four campuses,
which included a 5.8 percent hike in Columbia. At that time, Nixon said the move would make UM less accessible to Missouri families.

“Anything at or below 5 percent was reasonable,” state Budget Director Linda Luebbering said.

Nixon’s move drew criticism from Columbia’s legislative delegation. At a news conference yesterday outside of Jesse Hall, Senate Appropriations Committee Chairman Kurt Schaefer, a Republican, was joined by state Rep. Chris Kelly, a Democrat and member of the House Budget Committee, and Reps. Mary Still and Stephen Webber, both Democrats, who said they believe Nixon was substituting his judgment for that of the curators.

“To hide behind the rubble of Joplin is irresponsible,” Kelly said. “What you see is the governor inserting himself, and if you disagree, you get mowed over,” Schaefer said.

Nixon originally proposed giving the university $398 million, down from $428.1 million in the current year. During work on the budget, lawmakers added $5.6 million. But with yesterday’s action, UM will receive $393.5 million in the year that begins July 1.

“These actions aren’t easy, but they are necessary,” Nixon said.

In a prepared statement, Interim President Steve Owens said he was “disappointed” in the cut. He said UM was ready to do its part in the wake of the disasters but that the tuition hike was justified.

“Our board’s action was based, in part, on a 10-year decline in state support during which more was being asked of the university,” he said.

Meanwhile, the cut in school transportation aid will have little effect on Columbia Public Schools, Superintendent Chris Belcher said. The district anticipated the possibility of losing some funding from the state and built about $1 million in surplus for the 2011-12 budget.

“We were anticipating this. Never in our wildest imaginations did we think we were going to get the money they were saying we were going to get,” Belcher said.

The only item Nixon vetoed from the entire $23.2 billion budget was $30,000 for the Boone County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office to reimburse it for the costs of handling mental health commitments. The law allowing the reimbursement limits the number of counties that can receive them and does not include Boone, according to information provided that details budget decisions.
JEFFERSON CITY • Missouri's higher education system took the largest hit Friday when Gov. Jay Nixon announced $172 million in budget cuts aimed at balancing state finances and helping rebuild parts of Missouri ravaged by natural disasters.

Funding for universities was reduced by $14.9 million from what the Legislature approved, and community colleges were cut by $1.9 million, although both cuts were expected. More money was cut from scholarship programs, buses for public school districts, Medicaid and the judicial system.

The budget reductions were needed, Nixon said, in order to free up $50 million to pay for disaster recovery efforts in Joplin and flood-ravaged southeast Missouri. The rest of the cuts are designed to offset things such as phasing out the corporate franchise fee — which will cost the state $24 million in the 2012 fiscal year — and the failure of tax amnesty legislation that would have provided more than $30 million in added revenue.

"These actions aren't easy, but they are necessary," Nixon said, later pointing out that revenue projections are improving, which made Friday's cuts smaller than they otherwise would have been.

Because the total cost of disaster recovery is still not clear, and with revenue figures still in flux, state Budget Director Linda Luebbering said additional cuts may have to be made down the road. "But based on what we're seeing right now, we think these reductions are adequate," she said.

The state could tap into its $500 million rainy day fund to pay for disaster recovery, but to do so would require a special session of the Legislature. When asked specifically about the rainy day fund and a special session Friday, Nixon was noncommittal.

"If it comes to that, we'll have those discussions with legislators," Nixon said.

House Speaker Steve Tilley, R-Perryville, established a committee to assess whether a special session is necessary to address the needs of Joplin and communities in southeast Missouri. That committee will report to Tilley by the end of July. Its first meeting is later this month.

But for now, the state will rely on cuts to balance its budget, and the largest share of those cuts come from state aid to public universities. Those institutions will see their budgets reduced by $14.9 million. That's about a 7 percent reduction from last year, a deeper cut than the 5.5 percent
Community colleges will see a $1.9 million reduction in funding, also a 7 percent reduction from last year.

The cuts surprised no one. Nixon first proposed identical cuts in January, when he released his initial budget proposal. At the time, the prospect of a 7 percent cut to higher education was met with relief by many college and university leaders. Ken Dobbins, president of Southeast Missouri State University, said he had been bracing for an even larger cut.

Nixon specified slightly higher cuts of 8 percent for the University of Missouri system and Missouri Western because the schools increased tuition by more than what the governor thought was appropriate, Luebbering said.

University of Missouri interim President Stephen Owens said he understands the budget crunch created by the natural disasters. But the extra cut, Owens said, is disappointing.

Nixon's budget also includes $8 million in cuts in state busing aid to public school districts. Luebbering said this was needed because Missouri Lottery proceeds for education aren't likely to meet budget expectations.

Roger Kurtz, executive director of the Missouri Association of School Administrators, said he wasn't completely surprised about that decision. Last session, lawmakers had restored $10 million for busing, so Friday's cut left districts with just $2 million in additional funding.

Kurtz said that provides little relief for districts that have seen the statewide busing budget decrease from about $167 million two years ago to less than $100 million.

"When school districts get cut by that amount, the only place they can look is in their instructional budgets," he said.

Rural districts are the most likely to suffer because they are required by law to provide transportation to students living more than 3½ miles from their schools. Kurtz said they are already reeling from rising diesel fuel prices.

Other reductions include $13.9 million in cuts to Medicaid — although Luebbering said those funds would not have been spent anyway. The judicial branch saw its budget reduced from $170.1 million to $164.1 million, returning it to its 2011 funding level. Funding for overtime in the Corrections Department was reduced from $7.8 million to $5.8 million, with management encouraged to use comp time and other tools to save money.

The Legislature's budget was not immune to cuts, either. Lawmakers appropriated $32.6 million for fiscal 2012. Nixon reduced that amount by $800,000.

In all, 46 programs were cut.

Amy Blouin, executive director of the Missouri Budget Project, which advocates for spending on the poor, said she hopes Nixon calls a special session to dip into the rainy day fund. If lawmakers
used that fund for disaster recovery and then increased the tobacco tax or enforced an online sales tax, she said, some of the other cuts could be avoided.

"If the state can find other resources to pay for disaster relief, the funding can be restored to areas like higher education," she said.
Disasters force shifts in Missouri budget

By JASON NOBLE

JEFFERSON CITY | State aid for Joplin tornado relief and combating flooding in the Bootheel are forcing Missouri Gov. Jay Nixon to hold back more than $50 million from next year's budget.

Nixon, a Democrat, signed a $23 billion dollar budget into law on Friday. It will take effect July 1.

But the governor held back $57.1 million in spending from the state’s general revenue fund and $115.1 million from various other revenue sources that don’t directly affect the general fund, amounting to total savings of more than $170 million.

“These actions aren’t easy, but they are necessary,” Nixon said. “Because we’re taking these actions today, we’ll have the funds to preserve and invest in other critical priorities and services.”

The state has dedicated $50 million to natural disaster recovery efforts in Joplin and in flood-ravaged areas along the Mississippi River, although Nixon anticipates more will be needed for Joplin following the deadly twister that destroyed part of the city May 22.

The demand for those funds is largely responsible for the restrictions on spending in core areas such as higher-education and health care.

The biggest losers in shifting funds to disaster relief are the state’s colleges and universities. Nixon held back $14.9 million from four-year institutions, and another $1.9 million from community colleges and technical schools.

The hold on spending means most higher education institutions will see a 7 percent decline in state funding from the current year. The flagship University of Missouri system and Missouri Western State University, however, will see an 8 percent cut, because those schools raised tuition higher than other colleges.

Nixon had originally proposed a 7 percent cut to higher education in the budget he presented to the General Assembly in January. But lawmakers added funds through their budget writing process, so that when the measure returned to Nixon in May the schools faced a cut of just over 5 percent.
Friday’s additional reduction didn’t sit well with lawmakers in Columbia, home of the University of Missouri’s main campus.

Republican Sen. Kurt Schaefer and Democratic Rep. Chris Kelly — both of whom hold prominent posts in the budget-writing process — and two other lawmakers from the city held a press conference on campus later in the afternoon to criticize Nixon’s move.

“It’s an absolutely unacceptable and irresponsible decision on the governor’s part not only to take all of higher education back up above the 5.4 level passed by the General Assembly, but to engage in petulance and take the university to an 8.1 percent cut simply because ... he doesn’t like the tuition increase,” Schaefer said.

Kelly suggested Nixon was cutting university funding while taking political cover behind “the rubble of Joplin.”

Nixon’s budget director, Linda Luebbering, defended the spending restriction as a tough decision in a difficult situation.

“None of these restrictions were easy for the governor to make, but we had to make them...” Luebbering said. “After three years of making reductions, every single one that we make is difficult.”

Elsewhere in the education budget, Nixon held back some funds for the Parents as Teachers program and two college scholarships, but managed to maintain slight increases over current-year spending.

He also decreased the state subsidy for school-bus transportation by $8 million — a 7 percent cut — although that was made necessary by a drop-off in revenues from the state lottery, not by pressure from natural disaster relief.

State Rep. Sara Lampe, a Springfield Democrat who has battled Nixon over bus funding, said she was comfortable with the reduction, given the circumstances.

“I am really pleased with the cuts in front of me,” Lampe said, adding. “The cuts the governor’s made here make sense.”

Nixon also withheld $13.9 million in what his staff said was unnecessary funding for Medicaid, and eliminated a $6 million funding increase for the state judiciary.

Long-delayed construction projects at state universities that were to be funded with $99.7 million from the state’s student-loan agency also were delayed once again.

Other factors beyond the disasters contributed to the general-revenue restrictions as well, Nixon and his staff acknowledged.
The governor and lawmakers agreed during the legislative session to phase out the corporate franchise tax — at a cost of $14 million next year — and lawmakers failed to pass a tax amnesty program that was expected to raise millions in additional revenue.

Nixon defended both the tax cut and the decision to bank on uncertain legislation as good public policy.
Gov. Jay Nixon cut funding for education and other programs Friday to help offset Missouri's mounting tab from a disastrous spring in which a deadly tornado and widespread flooding destroyed thousands of homes, businesses and farms.

Nixon announced $172 million in cuts from the budget set to take effect July 1, including reductions in aid to colleges and universities, student scholarships and busing for public elementary and secondary schools.

Lawmakers passed a more than $23 billion budget in early May, just days after the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers blew up a southeastern Missouri levee and unleashed a swollen Mississippi River on an estimated 130,000 acres of fertile farmland and rural homes. A couple of weeks later, the nation's deadliest tornado in decades tore through Joplin, destroying more than 8,000 homes and businesses. The death toll has risen to 151 people.

Nixon has committed $50 million of state general revenues — which were not anticipated in the budget — for disaster response and recovery efforts.

On Friday, he cut a nearly equal amount of $57 million from other parts of the state budget. Nixon said the disaster aid must be a priority.

"When tornadoes hit, when floods hit, the state has a vital role to help recover and rebuild communities," Nixon said while in St. Louis for a bill signing ceremony on legislation reauthorizing a prescription drug subsidy for seniors and the disabled. That drug program escaped the budget cuts.
The largest reduction in state general revenues — $16.8 million — will come from the operating budgets of public colleges and universities. The result is that most institutions will receive a 7 percent funding cut next school year instead of the 5.5 percent reduction originally budgeted by lawmakers. The University of Missouri System and Missouri Western State University will get an 8 percent cut because they have backed tuition increases larger than what the governor believed was appropriate, said Nixon's budget director, Linda Luebbering.

Missouri Southern State University, located in Joplin, also backed a tuition increase that was more than Nixon would have liked. But Luebbering said Nixon decided not to cut more of its funding because of the tragedy the community has experienced. Missouri Southern has served as a staging area for some of the tornado recovery efforts.

Brian Long, director of the Council on Public Higher Education in Missouri, said Nixon's cut to universities was disappointing but not too surprising because the governor proposed a 7 percent cut when he outlined his budget plan in January.

"The (university) presidents are realists and keenly understand what it takes to balance a budget," Long said. But as a result of the cuts, "every institution will have to dig a little deeper to balance their own budgets in the coming year."

Nixon also cut $3 million from Missouri's scholarship programs, which Luebbering said would still give them $2 million more than they received this year. However, scholarships already took a hit in the 2011 budget.

The governor's cuts include $8 million from the nearly $108 million that lawmakers allotted for school busing aid. Luebbering said that reduction was necessary because Missouri Lottery proceeds for education aren't likely to meet budget expectations.

Before the nation's economic downturn began, schools had been getting $168 million annually to help subsidize their busing costs, said Roger Kurtz, executive director at Missouri Association of School Administrators. He called Nixon's cut "a little disconcerting" but added that he appreciates that it came before the school year started so that administrators could plan accordingly.

"The one thing that I don't think a lot of people understand is if school districts don't get that transportation funding, the only place they can go to get it is from their instructional budgets," Kurtz said. "Cuts in transportation funding do impact other operations within the school district."
Nixon's $172 million in budget cuts also include a continued freeze of $100 million for construction projects at public colleges and universities. That money was supposed to be transferred to the state from the Missouri Higher Education Loan Authority, but the transfer has been on hold for a couple of years because economic conditions and changes in federal student loan laws have put pressure on the agency’s finances.

Lawmakers had again included the projects in a capital improvements bill because they wanted to reaffirm that they still expect the buildings to someday be completed. But Nixon's cut to the funding came as no surprise.

Among the other budget cuts Friday were $13.9 million that Luebbering said was not needed for the state's Medicaid program, $6 million from the judiciary's budget, $2 million from the Parents as Teachers early childhood program, $800,000 from the legislature's budget and $200,000 from the state film office.
Public schools, universities to face deeper cuts from Nixon

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

Friday, June 10, 2011

ST LOUIS — Missouri Gov. Jay Nixon will cut funding for public schools and universities to help balance the state budget, school officials said today.

Nixon will cut basic state aid by 7 percent for public colleges and universities for the next school year — an increase from the 5.5 percent reduction approved by lawmakers. The governor also plans to cut about $8 million from what lawmakers had approved for busing aid to public school districts. That money could later be restored if revenues are strong enough.

Nixon planned to formally announce his budget cuts later today. School officials briefed on the cuts confirmed them to The Associated Press.

The cuts would come from Missouri’s $23 billion budget for the 2012 fiscal year that starts July 1.

Brian Long of the Council on Public Higher Education in Missouri said the governor’s office briefed him about the budget cut this morning. He said the reduction to universities was disappointing but not too surprising because Nixon proposed a 7 percent cut when he outlined his budget plan in January.

“The university presidents are realists and keenly understand what it takes to balance a budget,” Long said.

Roger Kurtz, executive director of the Missouri Association of School Administrators, said he also was briefed today by Nixon’s budget office about the planned reduction to the roughly $108 million that lawmakers had approved for school transportation. Before the economic downturn, schools had been getting $168 million annually to help subsidize their busing costs, he said.

Along with the education cuts, Nixon is expected to announce more than $100 million in reductions to Missouri’s budget. Part of that is because he has committed $50 million to help in
the response and recovery efforts to flooding along the Mississippi River in southeast Missouri and to a deadly tornado that hit Joplin on May 22. Lawmakers had not accounted for those expenses when they passed the budget in early May.
Missouri higher education funds cut for the third year in a row

By Suet Lee
June 10, 2011 | 9:13 p.m. CDT

COLUMBIA – University of Missouri System is being "punished" for increasing tuition, according to four of Columbia's representatives, with a cut in state funds to provide more money for disaster relief.


The UM System will receive an 8.1 percent cut in state funds next year, instead of the 5.4 percent reduction previously proposed by lawmakers, Schaefer said.

The $172 million in budget cuts will take effect July 1, when the fiscal year begins, according to an Associated Press article.

This will be the third year in a row Nixon has cut state funding for education, Schaefer said. He described the cuts as an "ongoing trend" for the governor.

"Keep in mind that the governor gave nobody a preview that he was going to do this," Schaefer said.

Kelly said there are several reasonable solutions to the Joplin problem, but "to hide behind the rubble of Joplin to cut the university is inappropriate."

"We can use the Rainy Day Fund," said Kelly, who was the chairman of the committee of the Rainy Day Fund after the 1993 flood. He expressed his concern for the students and their parents of the university always having to be the "loser" on these things.

"The whole state ought to bear the burden, not simply higher education," he said.
The state currently has $500 million in the Rainy Day Fund, Still said.

"I think it's 'raining' in Missouri," she said. Still said she does not see this so much as a budget crisis, as it is a revenue crisis but suggested that Missouri can look at what other states have done and learn from them.

Corporations will pay less revenue than the university, Webber said, providing a different perspective. Thus, middle class Missouri families will pay more because of the tuition increase.

"That's just simple math," he said. "It's a transfer of wealth. Folks at the top paying less, middle class folks in the middle paying more."

Kelly said the tuition increase, which was slotted for student financial health, was supposed to coincide with the 5.4 percent budget cuts passed by the general assembly.

"Budgets are all about priorities," Schaefer said, quoting Nixon at the State of the State Address last year.

The governor should do a wholesale review on some of the social welfare program, Schaefer said.

"When the governor makes the type of cut he makes to the university, that is one program out of billions in welfare programs we have in the state of Missouri that I think should be reviewed," he said.

For three years, rather than fund Missouri's future, the governor is taking money from state's future and continues to expand funding for the Missouri status quo, Schaefer said.

Webber, who is also a law student at MU, is affected by the tuition hike.

"The tuition increase actually affects me," he said. "I will pay hundreds, if not thousands of dollars more next year in results of tuition increase." The four speakers each said they felt it was unacceptable for the university to receive such cuts.

"I don't think anyone wants to see tuition go up," Schaefer said. In addition to the cuts, no one wants to see the quality of the education fall either, he said.

"We all need to come together to be part of the solution," Still said.
Roger Worthington to leave MU diversity post

By Janese Silvey

Columbia Daily Tribune Friday, June 10, 2011

Correction appended

Roger Worthington is stepping down as chief diversity officer and assistant deputy chancellor of diversity at the University of Missouri.

The announcement comes on the heels of a faculty vote that defeated a proposal to require all students to take a diversity course. Worthington said the timing is coincidental and that he made his decision before that vote. MU won't hire a replacement, at least for the foreseeable future, spokeswoman Mary Jo Banken said.

Worthington will go on leave and return in January as a professor in the College of Education's Department of Educational, School and Counseling Psychology. The position will allow him more time to serve in national roles. He was recently elected chairman of a Difficult Dialogues National Resource Center and named editor of the Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, a publication of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education. The latter is great, he said, but it's a big time commitment.

Worthington said he thinks he has addressed most of the tasks he was given as chief diversity officer. He started Difficult Dialogues workshops to promote discussion about diversity and conducted campus climate studies. As a professor, he'll continue to be involved in those initiatives, he said. Worthington also helped to create a diversity resource center. “There are many, many people doing outstanding work in the area of diversity on campus,” he said. “And those people are all still in place and will continue to advocate the mission of diversity.”

This page has been revised to reflect the following correction:

SECOND THOUGHTS:

A story about Roger Worthington said he was appointed editor of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education. It should say he was named editor of the Journal of Diversity in Higher Education, a publication of the National Association of Diversity Officers in Higher Education.
MU diversity mandate missed mark, faculty say

By Janese Silvey

Columbia Daily Tribune Friday, June 10, 2011

University of Missouri faculty cited myriad reasons for why they didn’t agree to require all students to take a diversity class. Misinformation wasn’t one of them.

Some instructors simply don’t think a diversity requirement is necessary, said Leona Rubin, chairwoman of the MU Faculty Council. Others thought it was a knee-jerk reaction to racially charged incidents on campus. Some saw the proposal as too broad; others thought it was too narrow and violated academic freedom.

There were “other reasons I’d rather not discuss in public,” Rubin told Faculty Council members yesterday. And those reasons, she said, highlight the need to require a diversity course.

MU instructors in May were asked to approve a plan that would have required all students to take a diversity class as part of general education requirements. Existing courses already teaching diversity issues could have been deemed as “diversity-intensive” courses to meet the requirement — much like MU’s existing writing-intensive program.

The proposal failed with 232 members voting against it and 210 voting for it. At the time, Rubin blamed the Faculty Council for not communicating the plan well enough to faculty at large.

Blaming misinformation hasn’t gone over well with those who voted, said Nicole Monnier, a professor of Russian. Faculty members don’t like being told they voted “no” by mistake, she said. “They voted ‘no’ for a reason.”

Few faculty members publicly voiced concerns about the proposal before the election. That’s likely because they didn’t feel comfortable speaking out against a diversity plan, some Faculty Council members said.

James Tarr said he heard “nothing but positive feedback on this idea” in the College of Education before the election. When he went back and asked colleagues why he didn’t hear concerns, they expressed fear about speaking against a diversity class. “It’s easy to vote in isolation,” he said.
Others said they felt Faculty Council proponents of the plan weren’t open to other ideas.

Rubin has said she wants to see the proposal come back to faculty for a vote next school year. Yesterday, though, several council members warned against rushing to put it up for a vote too soon.

“We make a grave error if we say, ‘We don’t like the way faculty voted, so let’s do it again,’ ” said Harry Tyrer, an engineering professor and incoming chairman of the council. He suggested faculty better explain that students need to understand diversity before entering a global workforce.

Joe Parcell, an associate professor of agricultural economics, questioned what happens if faculty were to vote against a diversity course a second time.

“Are we going to keep coming back?” he asked. “Are we hellbent on getting a diversity requirement at this university?”
Most University of Missouri faculty members think Chancellor Brady Deaton is, in general, doing a good job, the vice chairman of MU's Faculty Council said.

Clyde Bentley, an associate professor of journalism, spearheaded the chancellor’s evaluation last school year. Although he and a handful of faculty leaders have seen the results, they won’t be made public until Deaton reviews them Thursday.

Using an online survey, faculty members — including administrators, deans, department chairs and those not on a tenure track — were asked to grade Deaton on areas such as his basic understanding of university issues, his performance as an administrator, how well he uses resources and how well he communicates with faculty and the community. They also were given a chance to assign him a letter grade.

"Generally, most people said he did a good job," Bentley told the Faculty Council yesterday, noting that Deaton received “lots of A’s or B’s.”

There are concerns, though. “The chancellor rated low on communications, especially when it comes down to communicating with you, the individual,” Bentley said.

He questioned whether the communication issue stems from Deaton or from faculty. Out of the 1,900 faculty members asked to take the survey, about 400 responded. That amounts to roughly a 20 percent return rate, less than average.

Faculty Council representatives are now expected to go back to their schools and colleges to ask peers why they didn’t vote. Some said colleagues have expressed concerns about being identified. Although surveys were anonymous, the website doesn’t guarantee that computer addresses won’t be tracked.
"Two of my peers said, 'They can track our IP addresses on Survey Monkey,' and they believe someone will track them," said Joe Parcell, an associate professor in agriculture economics.

Others simply were apathetic about the chancellor's evaluation. Some of Leah Cohn's colleagues in veterinary medicine said they don't know what the chancellor does, nor do they care, Cohn said.

Although he's meeting with faculty to discuss the results next week, Deaton is already aware of some of the concerns expressed. "I will be working to improve on areas that appeared to be of some concern," he said in an email. "Overall, I am pleased with the faculty response and look at this process as an avenue that will lead to more emphasis on areas of concern and communications with faculty. ... I will be working closely with faculty council to develop improved processes that may be needed."

Reach Janesa Silvey at 573-815-1705 or e-mail jsilvey@columbiatribune.com.
Year after commissioner helped save Big 12, conference looks to be a leaner, smooth-running machine

By Dave Matter

MU mention p. 3

Columbia Daily Tribune Sunday, June 12, 2011

Q & A: Big 12 Commissioner Dan Beebe

Tuesday marks the one-year anniversary of the Big 12 Conference’s survival, one year since the day Texas chose to hang around in what was left of the league, allowing the Big 12’s pulse to keep beating. Skewered last summer for the Big 12’s near demise, Commissioner Dan Beebe now presides over a league of 10 that’s been enjoying newfound harmony and bigger paydays.

Earlier this spring, the league signed a new 13-year deal with Fox for its cable broadcast rights, worth a reported $1.17 billion. Recently, the league helped soothe an old wound, unanimously agreeing to split its TV revenue more evenly among members.

On Thursday, Beebe spoke with the Tribune’s Dave Matter to reflect all last summer’s shakeup and look forward to the Big 12’s future.

Q: Dan, now that a year has passed since last summer and you just held the spring meetings in Kansas City, how would you describe the tone among the leaders in the Big 12 right now?

A: I haven’t been here since the beginning, but I’ve been here for 8½ years, and I’ve never sensed as much unity and excitement about the future of the Big 12 since I’ve been around and, from what I’ve been told, since it was formed. We didn’t perhaps plan for what we ended up with, with 10 institutions. But once we ended there, there’s been a growing amount of enthusiasm for how we’re going to play going forward. The way we play is going to be different than the other conferences, and that’s exciting. It’s going to be more like what conferences were like in the beginning, which was everybody plays everybody in a geographical region that’s connected together. All of our states are grouped together for the determination of one true champion.
Q: Last summer, did you feel like you were fighting a war on two fronts, the schools that were leaving or threatening to leave on one side, and the fans and the media in attack mode on the other side? Did it ever seem like a winless situation?

A: There weren’t two fronts, more like about 10 fronts. (Laughter.) No, I never feel like it’s winless. For some reason, until the final whistle is blown, I’m not giving up. I don’t care if we’re down 21 in the fourth quarter with two minutes to go. I always feel like our team can win the game. Sometimes it happens; sometimes it doesn’t. Fortunately, last summer, it did. I competed in college sports. I played competitive rugby for 20 years, basketball until I was 48 years old. I’ve just always been a competitor. The biggest thing about it is you prepare as hard as you can. And we’d been preparing since the Big Ten announcement that they were going to look into expansion — and even before that because I had gotten wind of things. There were so many disappointing public perceptions of what was going on in the media, with the fans and everything, that we were just sitting there not doing anything and waiting for things to happen. Well, we had been active for months identifying what was going on and what solutions we should have, whether we should grow to 16, 14 institutions or not. We analyzed everything we could have possibly analyzed. We lost two members in part because those two members had issues with the conference for a long time. Colorado not as much issues with the conference, because they had always been more of a West Coast institution than they had been a heart-of-the-country institution.

Q: While things seemed to be crumbling, you made a case for the members to stay in the Big 12 based mostly on projections for the upcoming TV deals. It turns out you were right about a lot of the things you said about the future of the conference. Did you take any personal gratitude in being right? Were you vindicated?

A: (Laughter.) I take satisfaction that the things that I can bring to the table — perspective, analytical skills, not just my legal training, just my nature, investigative skills when I started out in this business with the NCAA — all of those factors played a role, I think, in making a case for the Big 12 that I think held up. So I do feel satisfaction, but I wouldn’t say vindication. I understood where everyone else was coming from. I don’t harbor any ill will toward the institutions that left or the conferences that recruited them. I have a great deal of satisfaction that the things I thought were important to this part of the country, to the citizens of this part of the country, to the institutions here, were also the things at the end of the day that kept the conference together. Different institutions might have different places that they land on that. Some of them might be more concerned about the student-athletes and their welfare, the ability of their parents to see their kids play. Others may have been more concerned about money and the projections we had.

Another degree of satisfaction was when we projected our television future last summer that helped make those decisions to stay, it helped that we were below where we ended up being. We ended up being in a better place than where we projected to be.
Q: A year ago, it sounded like any changes to the league's TV revenue-distribution model were off the table. Recently, though, the 10 schools agreed to change the distribution and divide revenue more evenly. Why the change, and why is the new model better for the league?

A: For one thing, one of the goals we had was to have all football games distributed. When we did that and got that done, the past revenue-distribution system of paying half the money based on your appearances, it didn’t make as much sense any more. So I thought and I suggested that we consider going to more equal revenue distribution of that cable money. That’s what ended up happening. We’ve moved from a situation where we’ve gone from 50 percent of our television revenue was distributed equally to 76 percent. Probably, overall, we also distribute our basketball TV money plus NCAA performance money based on performance, as well. But we probably distribute 80 percent of our revenue equally and another 20 percent based upon merit, basically being selected for television or advancing to the NCAA Tournament. And I would argue that’s more like the American way. We’re allowing institutions to benefit based on their market value. Take Missouri, for example. I think they’re going to be in a great situation going forward.

Q: Were those changes about boosting morale as much as they were shuffling money around from one school to another?

A: Yeah, I think it’s another example of what I said initially, that I’ve never seen as much unity, support and appreciation for each other as I’ve seen. Now, we’re going to have differences. But the fact is there’s this base feeling of appreciation and unity that’s going to help us work through those.

Q: What are some of the Big 12’s major challenges on the horizon?

A: We’re always preparing for our next media deal, and we’re in a position where we feel like we’re in a tremendous place when we get into negotiations in four years for it. We’ll always be evaluating the bowl landscape and where we’re going to be best situated for that. But, Dave, it’s those things that you don’t plan on that are the ones you have to be ready for, it seems like. You have to be nimble and quick on certain matters that might not be fully anticipated until they hit you. Our attention is focusing on some of the national issues. There’s a lot of scrutiny and pressure on intercollegiate athletics that we’re going to be a part of helping to address. We’re fortunate that we’re not having one of those major infraction situations like you’re seeing in other parts of the country in our peer conferences. That’s not saying we can’t be the next one that has a coach or booster or somebody cause a big problem. But those issues, the one discussed coming out of the Big Ten meetings, we talked about whether there should be an increased amount of grant money provided to student-athletes. That will be discussed. All of those matters are going to affect us, the BCS, the future of the BCS, all of that. We’ll need to be attentive to all of that.
Q: Did last summer's ordeal make you better at your job? Did it force you to address your leadership style and make you at all stronger in this office?

A: It validated how I feel about intercollegiate athletics. It affirmed some of the things I think I bring to the table in being able to apply certain skill sets to our business and focusing on the student-athlete, the student-athlete's welfare, their parents, the fans. Also, I really have a high regard for the citizens of this part of the country. We've talked before about how my family was rooted in Missouri prior to the Civil War days. I have family who fought on both sides of it, and I have a lot of affection and feel for these citizens. And I thought it would have been a huge travesty to have our major institutions located in conferences that weren't even in the heartland of America. Anything like this helps hone your skills and makes you open to those areas that you may not be as strong in. You have to sharpen up. It's like a ballplayer who only goes to his right. You have to focus on going to your left. I feel very good about our position going forward and my ability to lead this conference.

Q: Had things gone differently last summer, would this region of the country have been the biggest loser, if schools would have been scattered to other parts of the map?

A: That's part of what I wrote in the “White Paper” in my case for the Big 12. I was harkening back to my law school days and trying to make a legal argument almost for why institutions should stay connected to this part of the country. I lived in Kansas City for years, and living down here, you realize how many folks are connected up and down the I-35 corridor, off of that corridor and the states that run through that. There are so many alums of schools in Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma and Iowa that are in this part of the country and folks from here who go up there. There's just so much activity in this part of the country, if we had been split up, it would have a big travesty.
Dan Beebe paved way to the score

By Dave Matter

A year ago this month, Big 12 Commissioner Dan Beebe was fighting a war on two fronts. On one side, Nebraska and Colorado were about to leave the conference. On the other side stood a mob of fans, media and school officials bloodthirsty for a scapegoat.

“There weren’t two fronts,” Beebe said yesterday in a phone interview. “More like about 10 fronts.”

And then he laughed, which is something Beebe can afford to do these days.

That’s because a year ago everyone was writing the Big 12’s obituary. Now we’re writing its redemption song while counting the zeroes in its latest TV deal. And somewhere in the narrative, Beebe deserves credit — at least some vindication.

Beebe was the convenient fall guy to explain the Big 12’s near meltdown last summer. While Nebraska was beating Missouri to the Big Ten’s doorstep, while Texas threatened to carpool half the league to the Pac-10 and while Texas A&M was holding out hope for the Southeastern Conference, the common perception had Beebe locked in his Dallas office, lying in the fetal position, praying doomsday would take a rain check.

The Big 12 was about to implode, and Beebe’s MacGruber-like failure to diffuse the bomb — pull the burnt orange wire or the scarlet one? — would cause the annihilation of the conference.

A year later, the 10 surviving Big 12 members are walking hand-in-hand to the bank, happily cashing their bigger checks and professing unprecedented peace and love. Even better, a new revenue-sharing model promises everyone a more equal slice of the millions.

“I haven’t been here since the beginning,” of the conference, “but I’ve been here for 8½ years, and I’ve never sensed as much unity and excitement about the future of the Big 12,” Beebe said. “We didn’t perhaps plan for what we ended up with, with 10 institutions. But once we ended there, there’s been a growing amount of enthusiasm for how we’re going to play going forward.”

“We’ve worked hard to not let the little barbs get in the way of the big agreements that we can reach,” Missouri Chancellor Brady Deaton said this week. “People feel good with each other and where we’re going as a conference.”
Truth is, it was never fair to hold Beebe responsible for last summer’s chaos. The main criticism was that he sat idly while his commissioner peers Jim Delany (Big Ten) and Larry Scott (Pac-10) hatched grand plans to raid other conferences for new members. If the big-league commissioners were the Corleone brothers, Beebe was pegged as Fredo, full of good intentions but not as sharp or polished when it came to the family business.

But June 14, when Texas chose to remain in what was left of the Big 12, Beebe and the conference escaped their fateful fishing trip on Lake Tahoe.

Before it ever got to that, sometime around Christmas 2009, Beebe assembled his own war council of advisors, attorneys and network executives to begin battle plans should the realignment tremors turn into earthquakes. He was grinding behind the scenes more than the public ever knew.

“For some reason, until the final whistle is blown, I’m not giving up,” he said. “I don’t care if we’re down 21 in the fourth quarter with two minutes to go. I always feel like our team can win the game.”

Eventually, though, Beebe’s resolve would be measured by his constituency’s willingness to buy what he had to sell, starting with projections for the next round of cable rights negotiations. It turns out, the new 13-year deal with Fox, worth $1.17 billion, far surpassed those initial projections. In four years, the league expects to hit the mega jackpot when it renegotiates its primary TV deal with ABC/ESPN.

And at Beebe’s urging, the Big 12 presidents voted unanimously to split 76 percent of its TV revenue equally among members, up from the previous level of 57 percent.

Next month, the Big 12 will launch a new promotional campaign at its football media days, focusing on tradition, rivalries and the unique qualities that last summer’s changes brought about, namely the new nine-game conference schedule.

And that will all go down on Beebe’s watch. Like quarterbacks, he’s gotten too much blame for the bad times, and he’ll probably get too much credit for the good times ahead. Then again, Beebe played offensive line in college. He buried his head in the trenches and made blocks so that others could get all the glory.

Sound familiar?

Reach Dave Matter at 573-815-1781 or e-mail dmatter@columbiatribune.com.
Summer Welcome shows complexity of college life
By JANIE SILVEY

Right in front of a Tiger Tech booth at a University of Missouri Summer Welcome fair, Lana Bailey is ready to cry.

Her daughter, Katie, needs a laptop before she starts college in the fall, but they're not sure which to buy. A pre-journalism student, she has been told the school requires, or at least prefers, a Mac. But she's not sure what type of journalism she's going to pursue, and that will make a difference.

This is their second encounter with Tiger Tech, the campus computer shop that has booths set up around campus for Summer Welcome.

Earlier on Wednesday, after checking into the freshman orientation, they'd heard from a tech representative that Katie might need a 17-inch laptop for video editing. Now, they're told a 13-inch would suffice for $1,400 less. There's also a software package she might need for future classes for an extra $400.

"It's your call, baby doll," Lana says, adding that she'll help her pay for it.

Katie turns down Mom's offer. A recent Montgomery County High School graduate, she has worked in and out of the classroom to be able to pay for college. After working at a Montgomery City grocery store for three years, she now waits tables at a Denny's. She racked up college credit through Advanced Placement courses, secured financial aid from MU and picked up a handful of scholarships.

Lana, a single mom of two, is grateful for her eldest daughter's help. Katie will be a first-generation college student, so it's all pretty new for them. Still, Katie has realized that, to get a degree, she'll be sacrificing some experiences her peers will have.

As one of 6,333 incoming freshmen expected at MU this fall, Katie probably isn't alone in feeling some surprise or confusion about the complexities and expense of college. The tuition estimate for a Missouri resident is about $9,000, but the university figures the average first-year student will actually spend more than $22,000 once room and board, supplies and personal expenses are covered.

At Summer Welcome, incoming freshmen and their parents this month are getting a taste of the decisions still awaiting them on everything from what to bring to which clubs to join — and how much all of this will cost them.
Mom and daughter — sporting matching blue jean shorts — have wandered from the Tiger Tech activity fair booth in the MU Student Center to the actual Tiger Tech store, where they want to better compare computer options. They leave without buying, but not before passing a shelf of laptop covers, which cost $29.99 for a 15-inch computer.

They’re frustrated, but things turn around quickly. Minutes later, Lana gets the news she’s been waiting for: Katie’s request to live off campus has been approved. She’ll be allowed to live with a family friend in Columbia.

“Thank you, Lord,” Lana says, clasping her hands. An $8,600 burden has been lifted.

Katie has mixed feelings about living off campus, she admitted earlier over lunch in a residential dining hall. The idea of sharing a tiny dorm room with a stranger isn’t appealing, but she also knows she’ll miss out on the social aspects, many of which are touted during Summer Welcome: the Freshman Interest Groups that link students of similar interests, the experience of decorating small spaces with colorful area rugs and miniature refrigerators, the late-night pizza parties.

Katie is able to keep things in perspective, though.

Two weeks before her junior year of high school, her boyfriend died in a car crash. She wears a green plastic wristband pledging never to forget Tyler, and she never takes it off, Lana says.

On this day, it’s right above a Mizzou-themed bracelet that matches the tie-dyed MU T-shirt her mom picked up for her at the Conley Road Walmart.

Katie’s excited about starting a new life at MU, but she’ll miss home. A country girl, she and her friends like to listen to music while driving down gravel roads or sitting on hay bales.

“It’s probably going to be a lot different than our small town,” she said the day before Summer Welcome.

Mom is a little worried that Katie is too trusting and tells her several times not to get distracted in college. Later, she advises her daughter to join a self-defense class.

University administrators have told parents that students can call MU police officers to escort them on campus if they’re feeling uncomfortable.

Lana relays the message to her daughter.

“Remember that if some dude is following you … or, it doesn’t even have to be a guy,” she says.

Katie knows why she’s coming to college. At an afternoon session at the Missouri School of Journalism, she and Lana grin and break into applause when Associate Dean Brian Brooks welcomes the new class to the “world’s best school of journalism.”

The smile doesn’t fade, even when Brooks warns that college can be unforgiving and the program demands certain grades.

Katie approaches a journalism adviser in hopes of getting clarity on the computer requirement. The adviser tells her the school prefers a Mac but that any laptop will do for the first year.
Even more confused, Katie tells Mom she was previously told a Mac is a must.

Yesterday, the last of the two-day orientation process, they signed up to buy the cheapest 13-inch Mac model.

Lana and Katie are rule followers, and they heed directions given throughout Summer Welcome. They’re told several times that successful students are typically involved in extracurricular activities.

Katie already has one in mind. She wants to play intramural volleyball — not the club sport that requires dues and travel expenses, but the less formal teams at the MU Student Recreation Center, which should only set her back about $5.

At the activity fair, they look for another club. “They say you need to get involved in at least two things,” Lana reminds her daughter.

They stop at a booth promoting Little Sisters of the Gold Rose, a service group that provides volunteer opportunities and social events.

“How much does it cost?” Katie asks.

The recruiter touts that it’s cheaper than the Greek system: $80 the first semester and $60 the second.

Katie and Lana move on.

Reach Janese Silvey at 573-815-1705 or e-mail jsilvey@columbiatribune.com.
Student leadership key to orientation’s success

By JANES SIlVEY

Summer Welcome is under way on the University of Missouri campus, bringing in thousands of incoming freshmen and their parents between now and July 8.

The orientation program, which began running overlapping two-day sessions Monday, is a crash course in all things MU. Students learn about residential hall life and social activities while parents get information about campus safety and financial aid.

"It's one of the best programs in the country," said Dave Rielley, coordinator of new student programs.

He credits involvement from various campus groups. The Wellness Center, MU Police Department and various schools and colleges all play a part.

But at the heart of the orientation are the student leaders. Young enough to remember their own freshman year, the team leaders can relate when parents and students are learning the ropes. During a campus tour Wednesday morning, Helena Kooi, a journalism and international relations student, told a group the university might seem large with more than 33,000 students, but it's easy to see the same people again and again. She urged incoming students to get to know those people.

During a small group discussion with parents, Charlie Stoltze, a junior, warned one mom of a potential fraternity member to make sure her son knows housing rules in advance. Canceling a contract in a residential hall too late could cost thousands, he warned.

Students and parents also have a chance to hear from professors and college advisers. Mary Beth Marrs, assistant dean of the Trulaske College of Business, told a group of students on Wednesday to get to know their instructors and to not be afraid to seek help if they're struggling.

Between the been-there-done-that advice from students, tips from university and financial aid offices and other technical information, Summer Welcome can get a little overwhelming.

"There’s so much information, and they went over it so fast, my head is spinning," Lana Bailey, mom of incoming freshman Katie, said after Wednesday's programs. She'd tried to jot down notes on the inside of a welcome folder but said she wished she had a checklist of things advisers told her to talk about with Katie before school begins.

Parents and students who don’t remember everything have some time to process it all, Rielley said. "One thing we try to convey throughout the program is that although we're throwing a lot at you right now, you've got two months" before school starts.

Reach Janese Silvey at 573-815-1705 or e-mail jsilvey@columbiatribune.com
MU researchers find more evidence against bisphenol A

By Megan Cassidy
June 13, 2011 | 12:01 a.m. CDT

COLUMBIA — MU scientists warn that there is likely more bisphenol A circulating in the human bloodstream than previously believed.

In a new study, Cheryl Rosenfeld and a group of researchers at the Bond Life Sciences Center were the first to simulate a realistic intake of BPA in people through a BPA-supplemented diet fed to mice. The scientists found significantly higher levels of the chemical in animals exposed to BPA through regular diet than in the subjects that ingested a one-time dose.

Scientists in various fields have warned that the effects of BPA — an endocrine disruptor commonly found in household plastics — could cause a catalog of health problems such as reproductive disorders, learning and memory difficulties, and problems with the immune system.

"It can affect estrogen, thyroid and testosterone function, and might cause genetic mutations," Rosenfeld said.

Despite an ever-growing list of studies demonstrating adverse effects of the chemical, BPA proponents assert there is not enough evidence to discontinue or even issue warnings on the chemical. These arguments, Rosenfeld said, are bolstered by one-dose studies that don't reflect human intake of BPA through normal diet.

The MU study is groundbreaking because previous research had used unrealistic conditions to test the effects of BPA. Subsequently, human exposure was presumably underestimated.

"A previous study administered a single, one-time, liquid dose exposure," Rosenfeld said, which did not mirror the way people accumulate BPA by exposure to small amounts of the chemical on a regular basis in food.
The team instead created a mouse feed laced with radioactive BPA. After consuming the diet for a week, researchers found the biologically active BPA had accumulated in the mice's systems, and was significantly higher than the measurement done after mice ate the feed for 24 hours.

The study also showed that the initial increase of BPA in the bloodstream was greater when administered through diet — akin to human intake.

"The liver has to metabolize BPA," Rosenfeld said. She explained that BPA is introduced to the bloodstream quicker when paired with diet because the liver has to handle the food taken in as well as the chemical.

"This route of exposure potentially overwhelms the capacity of the liver to metabolize the food and the foreign substance," she said.

Rosenfeld said this study and others that reflect realistic human exposure should be brought to the table in the heated BPA debate that's prompted legislative action and caused some manufacturers to seek out alternatives.

Rosenfeld said she hopes policymakers consider her findings when dealing with legislation to reduce and potentially ban BPA production.

"I would like them to become aware of these studies," she said. "Single-time point measurements are probably not the most accurate method to measure BPA exposure in humans and animal models."

BPA is widely used to harden many common plastics. It is rough and durable, and additionally used as a relatively cheap coating inside of almost all food and beverage cans.

More than 8 billion pounds are produced every year, and the study notes that more than 90 percent of people in the U.S. have "measurable amounts of BPA in their bodies."

Rosenfeld said pregnant women in particular should take measures to reduce their exposure to BPA.

Babies have "even less ability to metabolize BPA and it can disrupt the growth of organs that are normally governed by sex steroid hormones," she said. "Even sometimes low-dose exposure to BPA can lead to striking effects."
At the University of Missouri, Homecoming is more than a parade, queen and football game. It’s a tradition that honors alumni, celebrates students, brings town and gown together and showcases all that is MU. And this year, that tradition turns 100.

“It’s a century of coming home,” Brandon Thiel, a student director, said.

MU Homecoming started in 1911 when the athletic director invited alumni to come back to campus for a football game against rival University of Kansas. The NCAA, “Jeopardy!” and Trivial Pursuit sanction MU as the birthplace of the Homecoming tradition.

“We are known nationally for starting the entire idea of Homecoming, so we are certainly excited about” the centennial, MU spokeswoman Mary Jo Banken said.
Other schools did hold earlier reunion events, so there’s been debate as to who should get credit, but it’s the traditions here that set MU apart, said Carrie Bien, coordinator of student programs for the Mizzou Alumni Association.

“It’s not only about serving the community but also service to the university, engaging alumni and showcasing Mizzou,” she said.

Homecoming isn’t just a weekend on campus. For two and sometimes three weeks leading up to the game, which is Oct. 15 this year, students spend countless hours volunteering and participating in a number of events. Students collect food for the needy — last year, they donated about 100,000 pounds to local food banks — and donate record amounts of blood during drives on campus.

Typically, some 15,000 to 18,000 visitors descend on Greek Town on the Friday before the game to see campus decorations, and about 25,000 people show up for the morning parade. Last year, the number of visitors doubled because ESPN also featured the Homecoming game on its popular “College GameDay” program.

Bien isn’t expecting to see those record-high numbers for the anniversary, but that’s OK, she said. “This Homecoming is all about us and celebrating tradition,” she said.

Students this year are borrowing from a tradition that dates to the 1950s, when students would gather on the Friday night before a game to dine and dance. The resurrected version of what was known as “Romp, Chomp and Stomp,” though, will be a massive tailgate event on Carnahan Quad after the morning parade and before the game against Iowa State. Alumni and parents in town for the weekend also will be treated to campus tours Friday.

Homecoming is a good way to showcase MU and remind alumni why the university is special, Student Director Kelly Heins said.

“It reignites their love for Mizzou,” she said.

The UM System’s Columbia campus has plenty of pride points to show visitors. The campus doubles as a botanical garden, and Banken said former students who are back to campus for the first time in a while will be astounded to see new buildings such as the Bond Life Sciences Center, the new MU Student Center and Cornell Hall.

Although some of MU’s assets are visible on campus, others show up in numbers and statistics.

MU, for instance, is the No. 1 choice of Missouri high school students, taking in about a third of the state’s college-bound graduates every year. And the more than 32,000 students enrolled at MU come from every county in the state, every state in the nation and more than 115 countries.

MU is the state’s largest public research university and one of just five universities in the country that offers law, medicine, veterinary medicine and a research reactor on a single campus. In recent years, administrators have been trying to connect those separate areas of study in more
interdisciplinary work. A 2-year-old initiative, Mizzou Advantage, sets aside money for researchers willing to work across disciplines.

MU is the university system’s flagship campus and its sole land-grant university, which comes with a federal charge to serve all residents of the state. It does that through MU Extension, which has offices across Missouri that provide agricultural, business and continuing education opportunities.

The campus got a national boost this year when President Barack Obama appointed Chancellor Brady Deaton to a key administrative post, chairman of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development. It’s one of several prestigious positions he holds: Deaton also is on the Association of Public & Land Grant Universities board, vice chairman of the Council on Public Higher Education in Missouri and serves on the board of the Donald Danforth Plant Science Center in St. Louis.

Meanwhile, the UM System is seeking a new leader to take over the four-campus operation. The system presidency has been vacant since January, when Gary Forsee stepped down.

The nine-member Board of Curators is expected to select a new UM president by the end of this year.
COLUMBIA MISSOURIAN

UPDATE: Missouri loan agency offers help to fund college scholarships

NO MU Mention

By The Associated Press
June 10, 2011 | 3:43 p.m. CDT

CHESTERFIELD — Missouri’s student loan authority has agreed to provide $30 million for college scholarships for the second straight year.

The board of the Missouri Higher Education Loan Authority approved the money transfer Friday during a meeting at its Chesterfield headquarters. The agency, which services loans to students from across the country, set aside the $30 million earlier this year with the expectation that the state would need it.

The 2012 budget, signed into law Friday by Gov. Jay Nixon, banked on MOHELA making the money transfer.

The loan authority also provided $30 million last year to help offset a portion of the funding cuts to the Access Missouri program, which is the state’s main financial-need-based scholarship.
MOHELA to provide $30M in scholarships

Saturday, June 11, 2011

NO MENTION

CHESTERFIELD (AP) — Missouri’s student loan authority has agreed to provide $30 million for college scholarships for the second straight year.

The board of the Missouri Higher Education Loan Authority approved the money transfer yesterday. The agency, which services loans to students from across the country, had set aside the $30 million earlier this year in expectation that it would be needed by the state.

The 2012 budget signed into law yesterday by Gov. Jay Nixon has banked on MOHELA making the money transfer.