Draft of master plan recommended demolishing University Village

By Andrew Denney

Thursday, March 6, 2014 at 2:00 pm Comments (10)

University of Missouri records show that buildings at the 57-year-old University Village complex had only patchwork repairs in recent years despite a 2008 recommendation to demolish it because of its poor condition.

The condition of the walkways at the complex had been a matter of concern for MU officials for years, and documents obtained by the Tribune show that work orders for repairs on the walkway at Building 707 were filed as recently as last year.

Columbia Fire Department Lt. Bruce Britt was on the walkway on Building 707 in the early-morning hours of Feb. 22 when the walkway collapsed, flipped over and fell on top of him. He was pronounced dead at University Hospital.

A 2008 draft of the Graduate and Family Housing Master Plan says that "deteriorating metal decks" at University Village "are a safety hazard." It identifies other structural deficiencies such as termite-damaged wood structures, aging windows, and "damp" and "musty" interiors caused by inadequate waterproofing ventilation.

The master plan draft recommended renovations for Manor House, Tara Apartments and University Heights, the university's three other graduate and family housing complexes. The authors of the master plan did not hold out as much hope for University Village, which was constructed in 1956. They recommended the complex be demolished by 2011 because it was too expensive to renovate and because it is in a floodway.

"There is significant structural damage and deterioration in all buildings except 702 and 703, which have been rebuilt," the authors wrote.

The plan also says University Village Buildings 707 and 708 — the only two buildings in the complex not located in the floodway — had "settled," meaning their foundations had shifted.
Buildings at the complex also lacked sprinkler systems and a central fire alarm system, the plan says.

The master plan draft was created by the St. Louis-based Mackey Mitchell Architects and the Gaithersburg, Md.-based Anderson Strickler LLC. Mackey Mitchell completed a report on the conditions of the university's four graduate student and family apartment complexes, and Anderson Strickler completed a financial analysis of renovating or replacing the complexes.

Mackey Mitchell and Anderson Strickler also worked on the 2012 update of the more comprehensive Residential Life Master Plan, but that plan does not include University Village in future plans for graduate housing.

MU spokesman Christian Basi said University Village is popular with graduate students with families because of its close proximity to campus and because the complex has a tight-knit community. Additionally, tenants like the low cost of living — a two-bedroom apartment goes for $504 to $614 per month.

"That has been a popular living space for graduate and married students, and it is a very, very convenient location and something we have tried over the years to make sure we have maintained it because of demand for it," Basi said.

The 2008 draft master plan called for University Village to remain in use until renovations at other graduate student apartment complexes were complete and for demolition of University Village to be finished by August 2011. The plan estimated it would cost $1 million to demolish and vacate the complex versus about $28 million to rebuild the structure.

"University Village will be utilized to provide 'swing' space during renovations of other buildings but will be vacated and demolished as conditions warrant," the plan says.

Emails show that in the years after the report, the condition of the walkways at the complexes was an ongoing concern.

Stanley Freeman, an MU Residential Life employee, said in a February 2010 email to Frances Palmer, former office supervisor for University Student Apartments, which oversees MU's stock of graduate and family housing, that "deck repairs" at University Village had been one of the "ongoing concerns" at University Village for the past "5 to 10 years."

"As a safety measure, we inspect the decks yearly and do repairs as needed," Freeman said in the email. At that time, Freeman said there were "4 or 5 decks" where Residential Life was planning to patch up concrete, reinforce beams and replace metal.

Records show a work order was issued last summer to repair a section of concrete on the walkway at Building 707, but MU officials say they are unsure what work was completed.
University Village walkway collapse blamed on deteriorated concrete

Engineering report finds deficiencies.

By Ashley Jost

Thursday, March 6, 2014 at 2:00 pm Comments (11)

Engineers have determined that concrete failure caused the collapse of a portion of walkway at Building 707 of University Village apartments that killed Columbia firefighter Lt. Bruce Britt on Feb. 22.

The structural engineering firm hired to investigate the Building 707 walkway after the collapse determined that water and chlorides and expansion from "freeze-thaw action" likely "combined to deteriorate the concrete to the point where its shear strength could no longer support even only the self-weight of the walkway," according to documents obtained via a records request.

The "Cause of Failure Report," dated Tuesday, was written by Patrick Earney, a structural engineer with Trabue, Hansen & Hinshaw Inc., a local engineering company the university often uses for contract work.

In the report, Earney wrote that the walkway's support beams, metal deck and concrete slab were "significantly deteriorated." Because of the state of the components, he wrote that it was "very difficult to pinpoint precisely what happened based solely on the observed debris."

The report says that the firm is "confident" the collapse was caused by the concrete shear failure. A shear failure is a sudden, vertical failure, said Trabue, Hansen & Hinshaw structural engineer John Smith.

Portions of the walkway's concrete slab were delaminated, meaning the concrete didn't settle completely when it was set, leaving excess air inside the slab. That can be damaging depending on the size of the delaminated area. The concrete also showed signs of severe weathering, the report said. Because the walkway flipped upside down during the collapse, the concrete slab was not easy to examine, the report said.
The loud noise heard by the person who initially called 911 the morning of Feb. 22 likely was the sound of the concrete failure, according to the report. After the failure, the walkway likely sagged, as witnessed by the 911 caller, but didn't completely collapse because of the remaining support, the report says.

"Once the load surpassed the bond and tension strength of the mesh reinforcing then the slab broke free from the ends and the front edge dropped," the report says.

The edge of the walkway dropped, struck the face of Building 707 and then the walkway portion flipped, landing upside down.

Britt was on the walkway the morning of Feb. 22 investigating what first responders thought was a roof collapse with trapped residents. A fellow Columbia Fire Department firefighter and a University of Missouri police officer also were on the walkway, but they were on the portion that did not collapse.

Trabue, Hansen & Hinshaw investigated the other 13 buildings at University Village buildings after the walkway collapse. Engineers paid specific attention to the walkways.

A report dated Feb. 23, the day after the collapse, says inspectors found "immediate needs" at Buildings 602, 604 and 709. The engineer said walkway framing was "questionable" and said "a catastrophic collapse could be imminent." Engineers recommended installation of wooden supports, which were added to walkways of all University Village buildings.

Engineers also found significant issues with six other buildings in the complex at 601 S. Providence Road.

Other documents released by the university show Building 707's walkway received about $4,000 in work last summer, but the documents provide no details about the nature of the work. MU spokesman Christian Basi said he didn't have more information about what was done.

Basi said crews inspected walkways at University Village at least once a year, but there are no records of those inspections unless they find a problem.

A draft of the university's Graduate and Family Housing Master Plan, a document that was released in 2008 but never finalized, said walkways created a "public safety hazard" in their deteriorated state.

Basi said engineers told the university that predicting last month's collapse wouldn't have been easy.

"We have specifically consulted with them, and they told us that, had they inspected the walkway a week before the collapse, they could not have predicted the failure," Basi said.

Engineers were able to identify walkway problems on other University Village buildings after the collapse at Building 707 because they knew what they were looking for, he said.
MU housing plan recommended demolishing University Village in 2011

Thursday, March 6, 2014 | 9:11 p.m. CST; updated 7:09 a.m. CST, Friday, March 7, 2014
BY JOE GUSZKOWSKI

COLUMBIA — An MU housing plan drawn up in 2008 recommended that University Village apartments, where part of a walkway collapsed and killed a firefighter Feb. 22, be vacated and demolished by August 2011.

According to the plan, the buildings at University Village, which were built in 1956, were in such poor condition that renovating them would require their demolition and replacement, at an estimated cost of more than $15 million.

The plan concluded that "the renovation of University Village is not a financially reasonable option" and that the complex should be vacated and demolished by August 2011.

MU commissioned the plan to consider long-term options for renovating its four graduate student and family apartments: Manor House, Tara Apartments, University Heights and University Village. It was released by MU on Wednesday in response to a Sunshine Law request.

The plan identified the buildings' walkways as safety hazards and proposed their replacement.

The walkway of one building was so badly warped and deteriorated that it rendered the second floor uninhabitable. That building — Building 708 — is unoccupied, but it is unclear whether anyone lived there when the plan was written.

Termites had caused "significant" damage to some buildings' wooden floors and wall framing, according to the plan, and this made several units uninhabitable.
MU spokesman Christian Basi said Wednesday that the university chose to keep University Village open because of its low cost, proximity to campus and community atmosphere.

On Feb. 22, the walkway of Building 707 partially collapsed, killing Lt. Bruce Britt of the Columbia Fire Department.

A subsequent inspection by Trabue, Hansen and Hinshaw Inc., a local structural engineering firm hired by MU, identified three other walkways on the verge of "catastrophic collapse," according to the firm's reports. Wooden beams have been installed under all University Village walkways to provide extra stability and allow residents to continue living there.

The university is discussing long-term plans for the complex, Basi said Wednesday, but he would not speculate on what those plans were. Basi could not be reached for comment Thursday.

University Village, located near the southwest corner of Providence and Stewart roads, houses older students and families. There were 109 people living in University Village at the time of the collapse. The 18 residents living in Building 707 have since been relocated to other university housing, hotels or residential homes.

**MSA seeks renovations to University Village, Lafferre Hall**

By Covey Eonyak Son

The Missouri Students Association Senate passed a resolution in response to the collapse at University Village that left a Columbia fireman dead.

Resolution 53-24, authored by Tigers Against Partisan Politics co-president Garrett Poorman, requests MU administrators and the Department of Residential Life to “investigate the full renovation or demolition of the University Village apartments.”
The Senate passed the resolution unanimously at its Feb. 26 session.

Poorman hopes the passage of the resolution will garner more attention to the issues at University Village and students who are advocating for change.

“MSA has a lot of influence on this campus, and I’m hoping that (the resolution) will catch someone in the university in the eye and make them see that students really want this issue addressed,” he said.

Budget Committee chairwoman Shelby Catalano made an amendment to the resolution to include a review by the Graduate Professional Council, since University Village mainly houses graduate students.

GPC President Jacob Wright said, while he was satisfied with the resolution passed by MSA, he plans to introduce a separate resolution before the GPC General Assembly. Instead of calling for the renovation or demolition of University Village, the GPC resolution will call for the renovation or replacement of University Village.

“Merely demolishing the complex would potentially displace those who live there,” Wright said in an email. “If the university were to demolish the complex, it would reduce the number of housing options for graduate and professional students. (GPC feels) the solution must not reduce these options for our constituents.”

Poorman added that while he is pleased with the passage of the MSA resolution and support he received from association, there is still more to be done before the issue is addressed.

“The resolution is symbolic and not a practical solution,” he said. “Getting that passed is only moving the ball 20 yards, and we still have 80 yards to go. There is still a lot to do and we have to make sure that energy stays on this issue.”

MSA President Mason Schara said the collapse at University Village has also brought to attention the need to improve infrastructure throughout MU.

During Engineering Week, Schara plans to lobby the Missouri Legislature for additional funding to renovate Lafferre Hall. The building scored a 0.91 on the Facilities Conditions Needs Index, meaning that 91 percent of its systems need to be replaced.

“The engineering students (are) going to be fighting for Lafferre, and I will be fighting for both (Lafferre) and other buildings as well,” Schara said. “But right now, there is not any (building) I am specifically advocating for, other than Lafferre. We are going because there is a bill going through the state Capitol right now that talks about funds for Lafferre Hall.”

Schara said he is also interested but unsure about advocating for funds to renovate University Village and will consult with MSA Legislative Coordinator Camille Hosman and Ben Levin, president of the Associated Students at the University of Missouri, leading up to his trip to Jefferson City.
Learning Curve

Round up: University Village, budget, data dump

By Ashley Jost

Friday, March 7, 2014 at 7:26 am

I’ll be spending the weekend in Kansas City for the Ted Scripps Leadership Institute through the Society of Professional Journalists. Hopefully I’ll be inspired enough to blog about what I’ve learned and what I can bring to this beat, which I would love to - as always - get feedback on. If you need me you can get me on my cell or via email.

Look out, KC!

Inside the system:

- Of course the big news of the week was the data dump from the UM System on University Village. Every media outlet received the same documents. A few of our stories so far on this subject:
  - University Village walkway collapse blamed on deteriorated concrete (link)
  - Draft of master plan recommended demolishing University Village (link)

- Following Rep. Rick Stream’s budget announcement Wednesday - which Rudi wrote about - Tim Wolfe shared his comments to the Springfield News-Leader. He was in Springfield Wednesday for the Show Me Value tour, and visited with the N-L’s editorial board.

- University of Missouri Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin did an interview with KFRU last week (Feb. 26). The interview (22 minutes) is available online, and it will start automatically when you click the link. He talks about the art education program, among other things.
Outside the system:

- To celebrate Women’s History Month, Stephens College has a new webpage that tells the stories of women associated with the school who are associated with the college that went on to do some pretty neat things after graduation.

- Someone sent me a few websites some time ago that are pretty fascinating:

  - The Online Colleges Database: This webpage has a lot of tabs that all show different data/information like highest starting salaries after graduation, among other things. Just a fun data dump when you have some time!
  - College Reality Check: This site is so cool. You can input different schools (in and out of state) and then compare graduation rates, tuition rates and debt repayments. What makes it especially awesome to a design geek like me is everything is really visual. See for yourself.

© 2014 Columbia Daily Tribune. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten or redistributed.

Posted in Learning Curve on Friday, March 7, 2014 7:26 am.

House budget chairman's plan slashes Nixon spending proposals

By Rudi Keller

Thursday, March 6, 2014 at 2:00 pm

JEFFERSON CITY — A spending plan that cuts deeply into Gov. Jay Nixon's proposal for colleges and universities, shifting much of the money to scholarships, sparked questions today about how the schools would handle tuition in the coming year.

House Budget Committee Chairman Rick Stream yesterday announced that he would limit the basic funding increase for community colleges and four-year universities to 2 percent of this year's appropriation. That is less than half the figure proposed by Gov. Jay Nixon, who tied his proposal for a 5 percent boost for universities to a tuition freeze.
Stream, R-Kirkwood, began presenting his plan to the committee this morning.

"I am a little concerned that if we don't fund the core at a level that allows institutions to keep tuition where we want it to be, where we keep it flat, that we water down the scholarship programs," said Rep. Caleb Rowden, R-Columbia.

When the University of Missouri Board of Curators met in January to consider Nixon's proposal, it voted to keep tuition stable for most in-state students. But curators also approved two new "supplemental fees" — $35 per credit hour for engineering and $25 per credit hour for arts and science students — that Stream said replaced tuition increases.

Stream called the 2 percent increase fair. "I would be interested to know which universities in the last year didn't raise tuition but raised fees per credit hour," Stream said.

The committee will continue considering Stream's budget proposal next week, and he plans to hold a vote Wednesday or Thursday. Stream's budget makes significant changes in Nixon's proposals for other higher education programs and sets up a contingent fund to recognize that lawmakers and Nixon disagree over how much money the state will have to spend.

The contingent fund, which Stream called a "Surplus Reserve Fund" in legislation filed this week, would receive up to $215 million if revenue exceeds legislative projections. Nixon's budget office expects revenue to grow 2.8 percent for the remainder of the year and 5.2 percent in the coming year. Legislative estimates peg growth at 2 percent and 4.2 percent, respectively.

Stream's budget proposal uses the contingent fund in public schools and for higher education building projects.

Stream's proposal for public schools will match Nixon's plan if revenue meets the administration's projections. Nixon had proposed $278 million more for the $3.08 billion program for funding public schools. Stream is proposing $122 million from established state funds and $156 million from the Surplus Reserve Fund.

Stream's proposal drew interest — but few expressions of support — from other lawmakers.

"I think it is an interesting concept," said Sen. Kurt Schaefer, R-Columbia, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee. "This may be a way to come to a compromise."

State Rep. Chris Kelly, D-Columbia, said he needs more details about how the fund would function. "It is just puzzling so far," he said.

Stream's plan includes $63 million for rehabilitation and construction on college campuses under the 50/50 match program. He would give $25 million to the University of Missouri System — $6.1 million to fund renovations at Lafferre Hall in Columbia and $18.6 million for other campuses — and make construction funding at other schools contingent on revenue.
Stream also proposed redesigning Nixon's plan for expanding the Bright Flight Scholarship program. Incoming freshmen in the top 5 percent of high school students could borrow up to $7,000 for tuition and fees at a Missouri university. They would not have to repay the loans if they worked in Missouri for four years after college.

Nixon had proposed a $5,000 loan and sought to make it available to all students who currently receive Bright Flight scholarships.

Media Views: Battle of sexes ends on STL sports radio

Dan Caesar • dcaesar@post-dispatch.com > 314-340-8175

ANTLER ALERT

ESPN plans to focus on the University of Missouri’s rabid student basketball fan group, The Antlers, on its “Outside the Lines” show at 8 a.m. Sunday.

The group has been kicked out of Mizzou Arena twice this season because of its behavior.

Here is a link to a preview clip of the show: http://espn.go.com/video/clip?id=10558045

PINKEL AGREES TO NEW CONTRACT THROUGH 2020

13 hours ago • By Dave Matter dmatter@post-dispatch.com 314-340-8508

COLUMBIA, Mo. • Fresh off becoming the winningest coach in Mizzou football history, Gary Pinkel agreed to a new contract this week that will pay him a guaranteed salary of $3.1 million through 2020. The University System Board of Curators approved of the contract Wednesday and Missouri athletics director Mike Alden released it to reporters this morning.
Pinkel’s last contract, signed after the 2010 season, paid him a guaranteed salary of $2.8 million through the 2017 season. Beginning in 2015 and through each year of the contract, Pinkel’s guaranteed compensation will be increased by $100,000. Pinkel’s new deal will expire when he’s 68.

Under his new contract, Pinkel can also make a maximum of $1.825 million in annual incentives, topped by a $450,000 bonus for winning the national championship. His last contract maxed out at $750,000 in possible incentives.

The real winners under Pinkel’s new deal are his assistant coaches. Their salary pool increases from $2.66 million to $3.2 million, with defensive coordinator Dave Steckel, offensive coordinator Josh Henson and quarterbacks coach Andy Hill each getting $50,000 raises.

The three lowest paid coaches on Pinkel’s staff — Brian Jones (running backs), Pat Washington (receivers) and Alex Grinch (safeties) — all received salary increases of at least 30 percent.

In his 13th season at Missouri, Pinkel guided the Tigers to a 12-2 record last fall, including the Southeastern Conference Eastern Division title in the program’s second year in the league. After an 11-1 regular season, the Tigers fell to Auburn in the SEC championship game but defeated Oklahoma State in the Cotton Bowl to match the school record for wins in a season, duplicating the team’s 2007 12-2 record.

The Cotton Bowl victory was Pinkel’s 102nd win at Mizzou — he’s lost 63 games — and moved him past Don Faurot as the program’s career leader in head-coaching coaching wins.

Pinkel was unavailable for comment but issued a statement through the athletics department: “I’m very honored and proud to be the coach at Mizzou, and I appreciate the opportunity. We will work very hard to continue to build our program and to graduate our players. It’s important for our program to keep moving forward and build on a solid foundation. I’m pleased that my assistant coaches continue to get recognized for the work they do. We are fortunate to have a great staff at Mizzou.”

In January, Pinkel expressed frustration with the slow pace of contract negotiations. Alden said the process took longer than normally but pointed out that Pinkel’s staff also received $400,000 in raises this time last year.

“That’s a pretty significant increase,” he said. “I’m confident Coach Pinkel feels good about the job his staff is doing and the way they’re being recognized.”

Alden estimated that Pinkel’s new salary will rank among the top 20-25 head coaches’ salaries in the country and around ninth, 10th or 11th in the SEC. Alden gave the same national and conference range for the salary pool of Pinkel’s assistant coaches.

According to the most recent figures as reported by various media, Pinkel’s $3.1 million salary will rank eighth in the SEC, in the same vicinity as Georgia’s Mark Richt ($3.2 million), Arkansas’ Bret Bielema ($3.2 million) and Florida’s Will Muschamp ($3.0 million).

Under his new contract, Pinkel owes the university a flat buyout rate of $500,000 if he terminates the agreement at any point during the next seven years. That’s a change from his previous deal, which called
for Pinkel to owe Mizzou $2 million for breaking his contract within the first year of the agreement, $1.5 million within the second year and a lesser amount for each succeeding year.

If Missouri fires Pinkel’s during the length of his new deal, the school owes him his base salary ($350,000) multiplied by the number of years left on his contract.

Part of Pinkel’s previous contract included $300,000 in annual deferred compensation into a private savings account. Under the new agreement, he will have access to withdraw $300,000 per year from that account for the next two years. In the third year of the new contract, Pinkel can liquidate the entire account.

Pinkel’s agent had discussions with Washington athletics director about the Huskies’ head-coaching vacancy in December, but Pinkel never interviewed for the position. Does this latest contract mean Missouri will be the final coaching destination for the program’s career wins leader? Alden would like to believe that.

“I’ve worked with him for 13 years,” Alden said, “and I think he’s been pretty vocal about how much he cares about Mizzou and how much he wants to be here. ... We know he’s had opportunities to do other things and he’s stayed true and committed to this institution. So, yeah, pretty confident we’re going to be working together for a long time.”

Here are the new salaries for Pinkel’s assistant coaches, with their 2013 salary in parentheses:

- Defensive coordinator Dave Steckel: $600,000 ($550,000) ... 9.1 percent raise
- Offensive coordinator Josh Henson: $550,000 ($500,000) ... 10.0 percent raise
- Quarterbacks coach Andy Hill: $357,500 ($307,500) ... 16.3 percent raise
- Defensive line coach Craig Kuligowski: $299,500 ($234,500) ... 27.7 percent raise
- Cornerbacks coach Cornell Ford: $297,500 ($232,500) ... 28.0 percent raise
- Co-offensive line coach Bruce Walker: $287,000 ($232,500) ... 23.4 percent raise
- Running backs coach Brian Jones: $282,500 ($213,500) ... 32.3 percent raise
- Receivers coach Pat Washington: $275,000 ($210,000) ... 31.0 percent raise
- Safeties coach Alex Grinch: $251,000 ($183,500) ... 36.8 percent raise

Here’s where Pinkel’s new salary stacks up in the SEC. The listed figures are according to various reports:

- Nick Saban, Alabama: $5.4 million
- Kevin Sumlin, Texas A&M: $5 million
Les Miles, LSU: $4.3 million
Steve Spurrier, South Carolina: $4.0 million
Gus Malzahn, Auburn: $3.85 million
Mark Richt, Georgia: $3.2 million
Bret Bielema, Arkansas: $3.2 million
Gary Pinkel, Missouri: $3.1 million
Hugh Freeze, Ole Miss: $3.0 million
Will Muschamp, Florida: $3.0 million
Butch Jones, Tennessee: $2.95 million
Dan Mullen, Mississippi State: $2.5 million
Mark Stoops, Kentucky: $2.2 million
Derek Mason, Vanderbilt: unavailable

Here’s how Pinkel’s contract incentives look under his new contract. For each category, Pinkel earns the highest bonus pay achieved, not each bonus payment per category:

Academic/social core: $250,000 ($100,000)

Academic/social aspirational: $100,000 (Not applicable)

Win SEC Eastern Division (not in championship game): $50,000 ($25,000)

Win SEC Eastern Division (appear in championship game): $100,000 ($50,000)

Win SEC Championship game: $200,000 ($75,000)

Appear in non-College Football Playoff/non-Tier 2 bowl: $100,000 ($75,000)

Appear in Tier 2 bowl (Capital One, Outback, Gator, Texas, Music City, Belk, Liberty): $150,000 ($100,000)
Appear in College Football Playoff bowl (Sugar, Rose, Orange, Fiesta, Cotton, Chick-fil-A): $200,000 ($100,000)

Appear in National Championship Game: $400,000 ($150,000)

Win National Championship Game: $450,000 ($250,000)

—

Win nine games: $50,000 ($15,000)

Win 10 games: $100,000 ($20,000)

Win 11 games: $150,000 ($25,000)

Win 12 games: $200,000 (NA)

Win 13 games: $250,000 (NA)

Win 14 games: $400,000 (NA)

—

$15 million in ticket receipts: $150,000 (sell 40,000 season tickets, $125,000)

More than $15 million in ticket receipts: earns 1.0 percent of ticket receipts (sell 45,000 season tickets, $150,000)

—

Named SEC coach of the year: $50,000 ($25,000)

Named national coach of the year: $100,000 ($50,000)

—

Top 25 College Football Playoff ranking: $50,000 (same)

Top 10 CFP ranking: $100,000 ($75,000)

Maximum incentives: $1.825 million ($750,000)
Missouri extends Pinkel through 2020 season

March 6

BY SPORTS NETWORK
The Sports Network

Columbia, MO (SportsNetwork.com) - The University of Missouri rewarded head football coach Gary Pinkel with a contract extension that will keep him with the school through the 2020 season.

With the new agreement, Pinkel's guaranteed salary will increase $300,000 to $3.1 million.

Last season, the Tigers went 12-2 and won the Southeastern Conference Eastern Division title, reaching the SEC Championship Game in the program's second year in the league.

Mizzou also defeated Oklahoma State, 41-31, in the Cotton Bowl, finishing with a final ranking of fifth - the second-highest finish to a season by any Tiger team.

"I'm very honored and proud to be the coach at Mizzou, and I appreciate the opportunity," said Pinkel. "We will work very hard to continue to build our program and to graduate our players. It's important for our program to keep moving forward and build on a solid foundation. I'm pleased that my assistant coaches continue to get recognized for the work they do. We are fortunate to have a great staff at Mizzou."

The Cotton Bowl victory was also historic, as it made Pinkel the winningest coach in Mizzou history. With a record of 102-63 in 13 seasons, Pinkel passed legendary coach Don Faurot, who went 101-79-10 in 19 seasons.

"It is important for us to be able to recognize what Gary and his staff have achieved for the University of Missouri," said Director of Athletics Mike Alden. "We're very grateful to the Board of Curators and University leadership for their support of our program, which is among the best in the nation both academically and competitively."
Since 2007, Mizzou is the only program in the country to rank in the top-10 nationally in wins, while also ranking in the top-five in both Academic Progress Rate.

Mizzou Athletics is currently in the midst of a $200 million facilities improvement process - largely related to football - as a sign of its commitment to competing in the SEC and on the national level.

Also part of the deal is in increase in the assistant coaching staff salary pool from $2.66 million to $3.2 million.

Read more here: http://www.kansascity.com/2014/03/06/4869754/missouri-extends-pinkel-through.html#storylink=cpy

UPDATE: Missouri football coach Gary Pinkel agrees to new contract through 2020
Thursday, March 6, 2014 | 10:38 a.m. CST; updated 1:49 p.m. CST, Thursday, March 6, 2014
BY KEVIN MODELSKI

COLUMBIA — The wallets of the Missouri coaching staff are going to get a bit thicker.

A new contract for Missouri football coach Gary Pinkel was approved on Wednesday by the University of Missouri System Board of Curators, giving Pinkel a guaranteed $3.1 million a year through the end of 2020.

The previous contract, signed April 2011, guaranteed Pinkel $2.8 million a year.

For the 2013 season, Pinkel was the 20th highest-paid head coach at the Football Bowl Subdivision level, formerly known as Division 1 in the NCAA, making him the eighth highest paid of the 14 coaches in the Southeastern Conference.

MU Athletic Director Mike Alden said Thursday morning, when details of the contract were released, that the new deal would likely place Pinkel in a similar standing. (Click here to see his entire contract.)
"We will work very hard to continue to build our program and to graduate our players," Pinkel said in a release handed out Thursday morning at a news conference in Mizzou Arena. "It's important for our program to keep moving forward and build on a solid foundation."

According to a summary of the contract, provided by the Athletics Department, Pinkel's base salary remained at $350,000, but his apparel, radio, TV and booster categories rose from $467,500 to $617,500. His camp pay will remain at $280,000.

Pinkel also receives a $100,000 boost in guaranteed pay for every season on the contract.

"I don't think that there's a correlation between an increase to higher successes," Alden said. "I think the fact is that we stay and continue to build the foundations we're building and keep doing the things we've been doing."

Pinkel's contract also updated incentive amounts, which are determined by the coach's progress and goals met throughout the season. If Pinkel were to max out the incentives, he would receive an additional $1.825 million.

Incentives included $200,000 for winning the SEC Championship, a $400,000 bonus for a 14-win season, $450,000 for a national championship and an extra $100,000 for National Coach of the Year.

Pinkel will also receive bonuses for making postseason bowl games. Higher dollar amounts are awarded for high-profile bowl games, such as the Orange Bowl or Sugar Bowl.

There are also penalties for terminating the contract. If Pinkel ended the contract, he would owe a flat rate of $500,000. If the university decided to end it, the university would owe Pinkel $350,000 multiplied by the number of years left on the contract.

The new contract also gives Pinkel power to divide $3.2 million among his nine assistant coaches. Offensive coordinator Josh Henson will receive $550,000, while defensive coordinator Dave Steckel, the highest-paid assistant, will receive $600,000.

Coordinators are still signed to two-year deals, Alden said.
Missouri’s staff was the 24th highest-paid in FBS in 2013, but 10th in the SEC. Missouri’s staff pay in 2013 totaled $2.66 million.

Pinkel, 61, has a head coaching record of 102-63 in 13 seasons, the most wins in team history. Missouri finished the season 12-2 with an SEC East Division title and a No. 5 ranking in the Associated Press Top 25 poll -- the second-highest season finish in program history.

Alden said he will have high expectations for Pinkel, but still feels confident in the coach for the future.

"I've worked with him for 13 years, and I think he has been pretty vocal on how much he cares about Mizzou, how much he wants to be here," Alden said. "We know that he is a Missouri Tiger. We know he believes in it. We know he's had opportunities to do other things, and he's stayed true and committed to this institution."

Probing Why Men and Women Become Self-Employed Later in Life

By Karen E. Klein

When Americans go into business for themselves later in life, is it because they want to or because they have to? And do the answers differ for men and women, who have different levels of savings, other sources of retirement income, and appetites for risk?

Amid the surge in older Americans becoming entrepreneurs, Angela Curl is probing these questions. An assistant professor at the University of Missouri School of Social Work researching work and retirement, she’s among the first to examine how gender differences motivate older people to choose self-employment. I spoke to her recently about her findings. Edited excerpts of our conversation follow.
You found that men are more risk-tolerant and may choose self-employment in later life at least in part as a result. But older women were more likely to have become self-employed out of necessity, since they were less likely to have a spouse, a pension, or a previous high-paying job.

Lower economic resources seem to suggest self-employment is a necessity more for women than for men. Men are already more likely to take a risk like becoming self-employed, according to results from nearly all previous studies.

You looked at data from a nationally representative sample of Americans over 50 and compared that with data from New Zealand. What was the rate of self-employment for each country?

Men were more likely to be self-employed in each country. In the U.S., it was 32.2 percent of men and 18.5 percent of women. In New Zealand, self-employment was more common, with 39.5 percent of men and 28 percent of women.

Were there factors that seemed to drive self-employment for men vs. women?

For U.S. men, lower occupational status and receiving pensions predicted lower rates of self-employment. However, there were no such effects for U.S. women. Research suggests that women may seek to extend their working career to fulfill work-based ambitions that were disrupted by child bearing and family commitments.

Retirement research shows that women are far less financially prepared for retirement than men and more likely to fall into poverty in their later years. Does that contribute?

Yes. Women may need to work longer to generate sufficient retirement wealth. Many people say they want to work longer, but many of them face age discrimination on the job, and many have been disadvantaged by their age in looking for a new job, so self-employment seems like a good alternative to them.

The men in your study were more likely to have working spouses and have pensions from their jobs. It sounds as if they saw later-life entrepreneurship as an adventure or wealth-generator rather than a financial necessity.

The men also had larger savings to buffer business losses or failures and more opportunities to engage in entrepreneurial ventures.

What other differences did you find?

Women who lived alone were more likely to be self-employed. If they rated their health status better they were also more likely to be self-employed.
Men were more likely to be self-employed if they didn’t have a pension to rely on, but for both genders, having higher wealth but lower income predicted self-employment.

**What are the implications of that?**

It takes wealth to start a business, and being wealthier probably gives you a different social network and more business opportunities. Also, people accustomed to a higher lifestyle may have to keep working to achieve that if their income drops a lot in retirement.

**What kinds of businesses are they starting?**

Men are more likely to be self-employed in blue-collar occupations in the labor sector. They’re working as machine operators or technicians. Women are less likely to report businesses in those sectors, probably not surprisingly.

Are Systems Bad for Flagships?

March 7, 2014

**BY**

Robert Berdahl, Steven Sample and Raquel M. Rall

**NO MENTION**

For much of the past century, public higher education in the United States has been governed by various forms of state university control. These “systems” and their governing boards define and harmonize the educational interests and needs of their respective states with campus strategic plans, allocate state resources, oversee capital development, and try to buffer institutions from excessive intrusion by politicians and state agencies -- important roles all.

And, because state higher education systems often comprise institutions located in all regions of the state, they are believed to be able to generate more general legislative support for higher education than might be possible for any single institution.

Yet despite the prevalence and best intentions of systems, it's not clear that good state systems any longer lead to good university governance. Indeed, it may be that university systems are inimical to the health of public flagship universities and to the states and regions they serve. As institutions have grown larger and more complex, it is more difficult for a single system board to
oversee and govern them. And systems emerged to manage growth in the 20th century; the current agenda and public interests are quite different, rendering them less effective if not obsolete.

**Historical Growth**

State systems emerged for good reasons. The financial exigencies of the Great Depression, then the explosive expansion of public higher education in the 1950s and 1960s, led states to create some form of statewide governance or coordination to allocate resources, guide growth and avoid unnecessary duplication of programs. Each state has dealt with the issue in its own fashion – some with one or more systems with governing boards, some with statewide coordinating boards, and some with advisory boards.

So long as states continued to invest in higher education, with new resources lifting all the ships in their respective fleets, university systems encountered little opposition. Flagship campuses frequently chafed at their incorporation in larger systems or at the resource demands of branch campuses, as well as the ambitions of smaller regional, “wannabe” campuses, but the flood of new state money quieted most of their criticism. University systems increased in number and influence through the 1970s.

University systems also increased their bureaucratic structures during this period, with system offices and coordinating boards invested with more authority. In 1971, North Carolina created a single Board of Governors that merged the University of North Carolina with the other non-aligned campuses. However, North Carolina also delegated certain responsibilities to institutional boards, allowing for the retention of considerable institutional autonomy. In Wisconsin, the legislature, tired of competition between the four-campus University of Wisconsin System and the Wisconsin State College System, in 1973 combined all four-year institutions into the University of Wisconsin System, governed by a single board of regents.

The merger in Wisconsin succeeded in moving the conflict from the legislature to the system itself, with the regional campuses often in opposition to the flagship, Madison, and the urban campus in Milwaukee. During the next decade, faculty salaries at Madison fell to last place in the Big Ten; efforts to overcome the gap were attacked by the regional campuses. Between 1980 and 1986, class size in Madison and Milwaukee increased 17 percent -- 70 percent more than in the regional campuses. Subsequent efforts to improve the funding of Madison were largely successful, but Wisconsin represented a clear case in which the flagship research university suffered as a consequence of the creation of a single consolidated system.

The moves toward greater centralization met with increasing resistance. As early as 1971, Clark Kerr, the principal architect of the Californian Master Plan, predicted such resistance: “The future is not likely to be simply a mirror of the past. Bureaucratic centralism is under attack in many places from many sources. The new theme is local control, volunteerism, and spontaneity…. It is unlikely that the multi-campus systems of higher education in the United States will escape from the impact of these demands.”

**Decentralization Takes Hold**
It is not surprising, therefore, that the move toward greater centralization and control began to recede in the 1990s. This “decentralization” took several forms.

At its most basic level, it involved the weakening or dismantling of statewide coordinating agencies and the reduction of bureaucratic controls over campus decision making. In some states, legislation transferred authority for certain management functions to individual campuses – retention of tuition income, where it had previously been submitted to the state for reappropriation by the legislature to the campus; greater control over enrollments and personnel; or independence from many state regulations. Changes in the authority of the major institutions in Virginia are examples of this form of substantial restructuring of the relationships of the universities to the state.

In a few states, systems were dissolved and institutional boards replaced system boards. In 1995, for example, Illinois abolished two multicampus systems. Florida first abolished its Florida University System in favor of separate governing boards for each university, then reversed itself in 2003 to reestablish a statewide consolidated system that presided over the separate institutional governing boards.

In at least one instance, the move to decentralize the power of systems led to the creation of a “quasi-public” corporation, with the transfer of virtually all management functions to the campus, which was then given its own governing board. This was the separation of the Oregon Health Science University (OHSU) from the Oregon University System in 1995. Subsequently, OHSU began to operate more like a private institution, loosely tied to the state. Its separation from the limitations of the system unleashed remarkable growth in OHSU’s quality and stature. And it became a model for similar moves by the University of Oregon in 2010 and after.

Unlike the period of the Great Depression, when financial austerity produced calls for greater centralization of controls of higher education, or the 1960s when expansion led to the need to rationalize structures and avoid competition among growing and aspiring state colleges and universities, the two decades after 1990 were marked by both austerity and limited growth and by efforts at decentralization of authority. The reasons for this can be found in the substantially different circumstances in which universities found themselves in recent decades.

First, public commitment to universities as “public goods” began to erode. The common view from the 1930s through the 1970s that public universities served the common good began to change by the 1980s. A tax rebellion reversed attitudes toward government and public expenditures; user fees often replaced public appropriations. The benefits of universities were seen as largely accruing to the individuals who attended them, with user fees in the form of student tuition replacing state appropriations.

Second, a corollary of this change in public attitude, was the fact that public universities facing declining state support, especially flagship institutions, began a quest for new forms of revenue, often through private fund-raising. Increasingly dependent on resources they raised themselves, either in the form of tuition or gifts and endowment, these institutions chafed at the constraints imposed on them by state authorities or system boards. State or system controls and limitations on institutional freedom of action may have made sense when the state provided the lion’s share
of a university’s revenue, but they made little sense when state revenues constituted a small fraction of institutional resources.

In a real sense, however, greater decentralization led to demands for even greater autonomy of decision-making. As the resources of flagship universities became more diversified, continuing limitations imposed by systems to keep all state institutions in alignment with one another – over tuition levels or faculty and staff salary increases, for example – became more onerous and crippling. The strongest flagship campuses within systems, which competed with the strongest national institutions for faculty and research grants, felt themselves the most handicapped by their system affiliations.

Third, a new philosophy of organizational management developed, stressing the importance of local decision-making and the inefficiencies of large systems with top-down management. The public higher education variant of this was called responsibility-centered management, introduced at Indiana University in 1988-89 and adopted shortly thereafter by several other major public universities. This approach allocated budgets within universities based on calculations of revenues generated and costs incurred. It inclined toward “putting each tub on its own bottom,” and encouraged academic units to think in terms of generating revenue and limiting costs. In this environment, state and system policies often became constraints. Moves toward greater institutional autonomy were consistent with the principles of RCM.

Finally, the research function of universities, especially the flagships, assumed a larger role in the “information age.” Universities saw themselves, and were viewed by their states, as agents of economic development. They were expected to interact closely with local businesses, their faculty to become more entrepreneurial. But to become truly entrepreneurial, universities needed to be liberated from state and system controls.

The first noteworthy effort to break a flagship campus free of its system came at the University of Wisconsin in 2011, when Madison Chancellor Carolyn (Biddy) Martin, with the support of Governor Scott Walker, proposed making UW Madison a “public authority,” separate from the University of Wisconsin System. Supported by the UW Madison faculty senate, the proposal met serious opposition from the other campuses and from the university’s regents and ultimately from the Legislature as well. Shortly after it was defeated, Martin left the university to become the president of Amherst College.

Also in 2011, the University of Oregon proposed separating from the Oregon University System in a manner similar to that achieved by the Oregon Health Science University 15 years earlier. With a novel proposal for financing the university, President Richard Lariviere proposed freezing state funding at its then-current level of about $60 million. This $60 million would then be used to finance a 30-year bond, whose proceeds would become part of the university’s endowment and matched by private endowment gifts. The endowment revenue would replace state support and, after 30 years, state support could cease.

Lariviere’s differences with the Oregon board over this issue and over a faculty salary increase put him and the university out of step with Oregon’s other public universities and the system. The system board terminated him in December 2011.
Lariviere’s termination did not end the University of Oregon’s quest to break free; indeed, it undoubtedly enhanced it. In the spring of 2013, the Oregon Legislature passed legislation separating the University of Oregon and Portland State University from the system and granted extensive institutional autonomy to separate governing boards for each institution.

Even within the University of California, generally regarded as the most successful university system in the United States, leading campuses have become restless with the lock-step constraints of the system office. In a paper entitled, “Modernizing Governance at the University of California,” then-Chancellor Robert Birgeneau and other Berkeley campus leaders proposed that the UC Board of Regents create and delegate specific responsibilities to campus boards. Arguing that the UC Board of Regents could no longer effectively govern the 10 complex campuses that comprise the University of California, the paper insists that local boards with more intimate connections to the individual campuses should be given the authority to set tuition, approve capital projects, approve appointments of vice chancellors, approve cost-of-living salary adjustments for faculty, and oversee campus endowments.

Advocates for institutional governing boards with greater institutional autonomy point to the inherent differences between institutional boards and system boards. System boards are, by their inherent nature, regulatory boards; their function is to balance the interests of all the institutions in the system. As such, they incline toward “one size fits all” policies. Rarely visiting individual campuses, system boards lack firsthand knowledge of the institutions; the decisions they make are largely shaped by information provided by the system offices and by the leaders of the system. System board members are not supposed to be advocates for individual campuses, though, given the geographic distribution that is generally sought in their appointment, they frequently are. While they may recognize the importance of their flagship institutions, they often view the claims of flagships as arrogant, and, in many cases, refuse or are strongly urged not to use the term “flagship.”

In contrast to system boards, institutional boards can be advocates for their universities, resembling more closely the functions of the boards of private universities. They are more familiar with the campus; they are in a position to evaluate more effectively evaluate the campus leadership as well as to understand the pressures and challenges under which it operates. As advocates of the university, they can be more involved in raising money from private sources.

Entering this discussion about the future and efficacy of university systems is a new volume of essays edited by Jason E. Lane and D. Bruce Johnstone, entitled Higher Education Systems 3.0: Harnessing Systemness, Delivering Performance. Most of the authors have either held leadership positions in public university systems or are scholars who have devoted much of their attention to university systems. As the title indicates, the volume proposes a new version of university systems that will guide the role of university systems to meet future needs.

Some authors recognize the problems university systems have created for themselves. Jason Lane writes, “In many ways, systems have become very functional, but not very strategic. They have become bureaucracies, not leaders, conduits for communication, not agenda setters.”
Katharine C. Lyall, former president of the University of Wisconsin System, is even more direct in acknowledging the failures of systems to address the needs of flagships:

"In many ways, attempts by several flagships … to separate from their respective systems after the Great Recession began to evidence the growing tensions between institutional leaders who are attempting to respond to market challenges and opportunities but who feel constrained by what is often perceived as outdated governance and financial models. These cases illustrate a larger frustration that systems no longer help campus leaders obtain funds, buffer them from government intrusion and demands or compete with other universities for faculty members and research monies. They feel caught in regional orientations and structures while trying to compete in national and global venues. Systems, seemingly caught flatfooted by these wider visions for their campus, have responded by challenging or removing innovative presidents to protect traditional system power rather than using these ideas to fashion new missions for both system and campus."

Most of the essays in this volume suggest ways in which university systems need to change to adapt to new realities and provide the means by which they can better serve their constituent institutions and states. But few of the essays, other than those of Lyall and C. Judson King (a co-author with Birgeneau of the paper on modernizing governance in UC), seem to recognize the unique problems of the flagship universities in systems or their singular importance.

Observers of American higher education have often attributed its success to the diversity of its universities, the mixture of private and public research and graduate institutions, the relative autonomy from state intervention, and the competitive market in which it has operated.

For most of the half century after the Second World War, the great public research universities of the United States, the flagship institutions in their states, succeeded in that environment, despite many constraints. Public research universities have been an essential component in the success of American higher education. During the past two decades, however, they have faced unprecedented challenges – growing enrollments, declining state funds, faculty salaries lagging far behind their private competitors.

While no one wants to see an unconstrained conflict among institutions within the states or to have the flagships beggar their neighbors, the future success of public research universities is essential to the well-being of the nation. It is time to ask whether their excellence can be maintained if they remain coupled to systems of governance created in a different time, within a different context, for different purposes.
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UNIVERSITIES START ARGUING AGAINST LETTING ILLINOIS 'TEMPORARY' TAX INCREASE EXPIRE

The Associated Press

NO MU MENTION

SPRINGFIELD, Ill. • Illinois' public universities are warning of serious perils if the state's temporary income tax increase is allowed to expire as scheduled in January.

Southern Illinois University President Glenn Poshard says institutions of higher education are anticipating a 30 percent decrease in funding next year because of an expected $1.5 billion reduction in state revenues.

Poshard told a Senate appropriations committee Thursday that budget cuts would mean larger class sizes, having more classes taught by adjunct professors instead of tenured faculty and an increase in tuition.

Western Illinois University President Jack Thomas says the state's backlog of bills has already created budget headaches for his institution.

Both presidents say increasing the state's minimum wage as Gov. Pat Quinn wants could heighten budget problems, requiring millions more to pay their student workforces.

Climate change report predicts resurgence of Missouri prized tree species

Thursday, March 6, 2014 | 7:52 p.m. CST

BY PAIGE BLANKENBUEHLER
COLUMBIA — The long-term effects of climate change point to a resurgence of shortleaf pine, a prized tree species that thrived in Missouri 150 years ago.

Some of the region's tree species, however, won't be so fortunate, according to a report by the U.S. Forest Service detailing the effects of climate change in the agency's central hardwoods region, which includes the Ozarks.

Sugar maple, white ash and American beech are vulnerable to a loss in numbers from an "increase in temperature, a longer growing season and less soil moisture toward the end of the growing season," according to a National Research Station news release about the report.

Shortleaf pine numbers should increase in the region, based on the extensive report on possible effects to hardwoods in the central region during the next 100 years.

The species is well-adapted to dry conditions and poor soil and was widespread until a surge in the logging industry during the 1800s, said Rose-Marie Muzika, MU professor of forestry.

"It's not a native tree to Boone County, but 150 years ago it was much more common," she said. "It's a highly prized tree."

Muzika said the more vulnerable species — sugar maple, white ash and American beech — are "on the fringe" of central Missouri, with small clusters in the Ozarks, but the species primarily thrive in the Northeast and Appalachia.

Muzika said the findings of the long-term effects on mid-Missouri ecology in the region were to be expected. She's more concerned with possible effects on agriculture.

The Midwest lies on the boundary of wooded forest areas and agricultural lands, making it "a different kind of forest," with a wide array of ecosystems represented, Muzika said.

"Big change requires centuries to realize," Muzika said. "Big changes in agriculture could come right away but big changes in forestry take decades."

Effects on agriculture
Missouri's agriculture can expect lower yield from the changes in climate, said Don Day, the MU Extension associate of energy who has studied climate change effects on farming economy for several years.

"That's a year-to-year thing but in the long run we'll probably see lower yields," he said.

Missouri's main crops in the agriculture industry are corn, soy beans and wheat — all will be affected, he said.

Muzika said that effects of climate change hinge on numerous variables.

"Climate change is very unpredictable but it's also important to remember that nature too, is very unpredictable," Muzika said.

Local conditions must persist, trees must be able to reproduce, and drought and soil play a large role on the effects of those variables, Muzika said.

"Sustaining ecology systems is extremely important," Muzika said. "We need to plan for a huge scope of possibilities."

**More report highlights**

The report also highlights a concern for "forest fragmentation" that could make it harder for new species to live in "future climate conditions."

As the land becomes less habitable for certain species, it will take longer for new species to move into the places of current ones, according to the report.

"Forest landscape models indicate that a major shift in forest composition across the landscape may take 100 years or more in the absence of major disturbances," according to the report.

Climate conditions will increase fire risks by the end of the century, concluded contributors to the report, including Hong He, MU professor in the School of Natural Resources.
Kaycee Nail is a junior communication and women's and gender studies major at MU. She is currently studying abroad again in Lancaster, England. The following is excerpted from a speech Kaycee gave.
Classwork began that week typically consisting of several lectures throughout the day. We heard from many different counseling centers, professors and religious groups, additionally taking trips to see many of these organization’s sites. One organization that stood out to me was called the Avenir, an organization of women who were widowed and often sexually assaulted during the genocide. This center provided women with legal assistance, counseling, a place to stay if needed and allowed women to participate in income generating activities to support their families. We heard several of their personal testimonies while we were there. Throughout our trip we heard many more testimonies from survivors, and even perpetrators when we visited a reconciliation village, where survivors and perpetrators now live side by side.

During the evenings we were free to do as we pleased, and though a lot of the group stayed at home, I chose to take advantage of all the time I had there. I became good friends with one of our chaperones, a 23-year-old Rwandan student who called himself Steve. Often in the evenings Steve would take me to his friends’ houses so I could meet more of the local people, and many evenings I would convince our group to go out to the local karaoke bar or other restaurants.

The second half of my trip, I spent my time at the Prison Fellowship of Rwanda. Each day I would get to go work with about 64 children who lost at least one parent that they called “street kids.” Another classmate and I quickly grew to love these kids, as each day we were greeted with 64 hugs.

Studying the genocide was becoming more real. I remember visiting a memorial site one day; it was the second one we had visited. Looking back to that day, it was hard to recall just how emotional I felt, so the following is excerpts from my journal entry from that day:

**June 5:** This day was probably my most stressful and difficult time I have had in Rwanda. In the afternoon we visited a memorial site. Though we had visited sites before, this one had a different impact on me. Before this point I had been studying and reading, and yes things would make me sad. It was tough to read and hear about, but I had never felt very strong emotions. In a way, I had been waiting for everything to hit me, and today it did. We walked up to the memorial site, a church with concrete walls and floors. Thousands of people had been hiding in this church, and during the genocide everyone in the church was killed. We walked into the church and it was full of pews. The pews were stacked with carefully folded clothes, all the clothing of people who had
been killed there. We had seen pictures and watched videos. But for me, seeing these clothes made everything more real to me. I couldn’t help but think about the stories behind each of those articles of clothing. Who wore them, how they ended up there. I could not stop thinking about Steve while I was here. I thought about how he loved to dance, how smart he was, and how he has been one of the most amazing individuals I have ever met. I couldn’t help but cry through the site, the first time I had cried since well before the trip.

I have heard people say that it wasn’t our “job” to be involved in the events that took place in 1994 in Rwanda, but in my opinion, this is simply not true. The events that took place were not just crimes against individuals, but crimes against humanity. I believe that if you are a human being, this is your problem. Nations and government bodies around the world turned their backs on the events that happened in Rwanda, avoiding the word genocide so that avoidance could be justified. Many of these groups now show remorse, saying they could have put a stop to the genocide. It is hard for me to hear that people just messed up. Oops, we’ll do better next time. Though I understand there is a lot that goes into these decisions, that does not alleviate the frustrations.

However you look at it, it happened and there is nothing can be done about that now but to move forward and learn from the past. The people of Rwanda are absolutely inspiring. It is now one of the safest and cleanest countries in Africa. Hutus and Tutsis live side by side, something that amazes me. I have heard many who thought this would not be possible. They believed that after the genocide, the country would have to be divided by ethnic groups. This country proved everyone wrong. Though Rwanda, as does every country, has its problems, their progress cannot be overlooked. I have come to know people who survived the genocide, including my professor, Steve and our other chaperone Emmanuel – all people we became very close with in our time there. It is hard to learn what these people went through, and what everyone in this nation went through. But it is inspiring to see the people they are today.

I would like to end with some words from my friend Steve. Steve is a genocide survivor and lost most of his family when he was only three years old, except for one sister. I remember us talking about his life in Rwanda. And I remember this is what he said: “I didn’t choose to be Rwandese. But God put me here and I trust him, so I don’t mind. I do not know what my purpose is here. But I trust this is where I am supposed to be.
Some days I feel hopeless, but I don't mind. Some days I get meals, and that's great. Some days I don't, but that's OK. Life goes on."