Retired MU chancellor Deaton wins state honor

COLUMBIA, Mo. (AP) **Former University of Missouri chancellor Brady Deaton is joining a select group of well-known Missourians honored for their contributions to the state.**

Deaton is the 2014 recipient of the Missourian Award, which recognizes civic, business, political and artistic leaders. Nominees must have been either born in Missouri or made their marks while living in the state.

The chancellor emeritus of the flagship Columbia campus joins past honorees such as Walter Cronkite, George Washington Carver, Walt Disney, Mark Twain and Harry S. Truman. The award was created 20 years ago by Springfield businessman Ralph Stevens and his late wife, Corrine.

Deaton retired last year after nearly a decade of leadership at Missouri marked by sizable enrollment growth, a campus building boom and the school’s move to the Southeastern Conference.
Cool July in Columbia runs counter to record world temperatures
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While most of the world baked in record heat during June, Mid-Missouri was near average. National and world figures haven’t been compiled for July, but locally it will go down as the sixth-coolest for Columbia since record-keeping began in 1890.

“There is a perfectly good explanation,” said Tony Lupo, chairman of the Atmospheric Science Department at the University of Missouri. “Temperatures globally are about the warmest they have been for 125 years. There is an El Niño forming out in the Pacific, and with that you get a lot of warm water that will bump global temperatures up.”

As an El Niño forms, Lupo said, records show that summers are cool in Central Missouri.

The average temperature for July in Columbia was 73.3 degrees, ranking it just behind 1905 and the coolest since an average of 72.3 in 2009. The month brought a return of the weather pattern that helped usher bitter cold into the region in January, said Jayson Gosselin, a meteorologist with National Weather Service’s St. Louis forecast office.

“Essentially we are getting air flow from Canada,” Gosselin said. “Usually it is from the southern plains or the desert Southwest at this time of year.”

Long-range forecasts indicate that cooler-than-normal temperatures should continue this month and possibly into fall, Gosselin said.

And with El Niño in place, winter is likely to be warmer and drier than normal, Lupo said.

The El Niño-La Niña pattern is a Pacific Ocean phenomenon of warming and cooling water. El Niño is named for warm water that forms in the eastern Pacific and historically has been most noticeable around Christmas.

Globally, the land and sea surface temperature was 1.3 degrees above the 20th century average for June, the warmest global reading ever recorded for that month, the National Climactic Data
Center reported recently. Land temperatures were the seventh-warmest, while the sea surface showed the largest departure from average for any month on record.

There is no doubt the globe is warming, Lupo said. “There is some disagreement in the community as to whether we will progressively get warmer or if there will be a cool interlude,” he said. “But long term, 100 years out, it is going to be warmer.”

The questions for atmospheric scientists, Lupo said, are how much of the warming is a natural pattern and how much is because of human activity. “There are very, very few people who deny there is human impact,” he said. “It is a matter of how much. I tend to have this view that is lower. Some would say that I am a denier. It is impossible to put a hard percentage on it. Almost anybody who does is doing so as a gut feeling.”

Lupo’s gut feeling, he said, is that humans are responsible for about one-fourth of the warming. It is a big enough share that people should change their habits to mitigate their impact, he said.

“Yes, any time the climate changes, we should be changing our behavior,” he said. “Adaptation to climate change has always worked for human beings.”

---

Student subsidies are a common play for college sports programs

Big-dollar TV contracts haven’t turned off college athletic departments from having students subsidize their operations, according to a study by The Kansas City Star.

Student subsidies for athletics topped $1 million in five of eight public universities in the Big 12 Conference and seven of 13 universities in the Southeastern Conference during the 2012-13 school year, according to The Star.

The University of Kansas Athletic Department received $1.1 million in student fees during the year studied. Students voted to reduce that fee this past year, only to see the Athletic Department take prime student basketball seats and increase the cost of student tickets for basketball and football.

The University of Missouri had no student fees going for athletics, although sports did receive a $1.5 million direct subsidy from the school.
An NCAA Power Grab
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I recently left the confines of Division I athletics and delivered a commencement address at a Division III college where athletes compete without scholarship in true amateur fashion. If you travel far enough back in the last century, that’s the way it was in intercollegiate athletics, as evidenced by Daniel James Brown’s fine book on the University of Washington rowing team, The Boys in the Boat. It was the 1930s and the young men who won the gold medal in crew at Hitler’s Olympics were not on scholarship. They were just glad to get on the team so the university could line up a part-time job on campus to help pay their tuition.

The NCAA has ranged far afield from the amateur athletics model of days gone by and most of the reforms recently proposed by the NCAA would move it even closer to professional sports. Of course, Division I athletics is already big business, producing millions of dollars in revenue for universities willing and able to make the most expensive investments in their programs -- programs that look less and less like they bear any relationship to the university’s mission and role.

Over the past three decades, the NCAA has regularly tweaked its governance structure to perpetuate the dominance of a few dozen universities. The so-called “big five” conferences, which have the most resources, continue to pull the strings, with two conferences (the Big Ten and Southeastern Athletic Conferences) taking the lead in calling the shots for the others. It seems they are never satisfied with their bloated athletic budgets, especially when threatened in recent years by upstart, so-called mid-major programs that steal recruits, oftentimes beat the big boys, “mess with” the national rankings and sometimes take postseason bowl games and revenue away from the anointed few. If they have the resources to outspend their Division I colleagues, then why not fix the NCAA rules to let them do so.
The latest round of NCAA reforms proposes a new governance structure that President Harris Pastides of the University of South Carolina described in a *New York Times* op-ed piece as allowing universities “to independently determine at what level they can provide resources to benefit students.”

Now there’s a surefire way to kick off a race for larger athletics budgets. At the very least, they are to be commended for their honesty.

Of course, this grab for money and power is couched in the noblest of terms -- it’s all about the athletes and paying them beyond the scholarship because they generate revenue for the programs.

Forget the fact that only two Division I sports -- men’s football and men’s basketball -- produce the millions of dollars that fuel the NCAA sports empire and member universities, although all but a couple of dozen operate in the red anyway. All other athletes, while valuable members of the university community, play little if any role in revenue generation for the university. Their teams are called non-revenue sports for a reason.

So what do full scholarship athletes receive now for competing in Division 1 athletics? They receive a scholarship consisting of full tuition, room and board, books and fees, and will leave the university primarily debt-free, unlike the average university student, who will leave with $23,000 of debt.

In some of the most expensive sports -- football and basketball come to mind -- special training tables give athletes access to a quantity and quality of food not provided to other students. Athletic programs provide academic support in the form of study halls, computer access, tutoring, advising and life skills programming, usually not available to their non-athlete counterparts. Athletes receive special academic privileges such as signing up for class before the rush of other students, guaranteeing athletes get the classes of their choice. Athletes receive free professional-level coaching, strength and fitness training, nutritional guidance and access to athletic trainers and physical therapists. In the case of football, athletes travel to games in chartered jets with first-class luxury.
It is sometimes hard to believe that our finest universities and their presidents are behind this effort to fuel what the former NCAA President Myles Brand termed the “arms race” in Division I athletic budgets. You would think that the primacy of the academic mission and the long-held principles of amateur athletics would trump the drive toward commercialism and professionalism in the athletic department. You would think that university presidents would be up in arms at the way the NFL and the NBA use the universities’ athletic departments as training camps and minor league clubs for professional sports.

It is beyond me why university presidents are so quick to fall in line with powerful conference commissioners who seem to be calling the shots with these NCAA reforms. But I have no doubt why the power conferences are working to separate themselves from some Division I universities who still see the value of equity and fairness in athletic funding. Lately, those pesky mid-major programs such as Boise State -- my university -- and many others have showed up the big boys for what they are -- wasteful models of athletic spending that cannot be justified.

The year that Boise State beat Oklahoma in the Fiesta Bowl our entire football budget was less than the salary alone of the Oklahoma football coach. Today, as a USA Today database shows, the Boise State budget for the entire athletic program is $37 million -- and I’m sure there are some who think that excessive. But contrast that budget to the University of Alabama at $124 million, the University of Illinois at $77 million, the University of Nebraska at $83 million or the University of Missouri at $64 million.

What accounts for the difference, you ask? The absurd specialization in staffing and coaching accounts for some of this, with recruiting coaches’ assignments reaching as far down as the sophomore year in high school. How embarrassing to spend all that money and then have someone with half the budget or less beat you on Saturday afternoon or, more problematical, beat you in the academic progress department, as Boise State has done to most of Division I for the past four years!

It’s time for the NCAA to take a stand for fiscal responsibility and the rightful place of intercollegiate athletics in American higher education and put a stop to the arms race by rejecting all reforms that turn an already premier and first-class experience
for athletes who are also students into a system that simply models professional sports.

Three aspects of the NCAA reforms do make sense and should take precedence over all other issues. First, improved medical monitoring and changes in some rules on the field can avoid the serious aftereffects of concussion injuries. Second, student-athletes deserve the opportunity to come back after their playing days and finish their education at the university’s expense. Finally, there must be rules about how to protect a student from loss of an athletic scholarship because of a career-ending injury.

In the end, it’s about getting our priorities straight and focusing on the real student-athlete issues, not those fabricated by the elite few with ulterior motives.

The NCAA cannot fall prey to phony arguments about student welfare when the real goal of some of these so-called reformers is to create a plutocracy of athletic programs that serves no useful purpose in American higher education.
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Top college fund-raisers are mostly optimistic about the future, but the poor colleges are getting poorer, according to a new survey of advancement officials at 335 North American institutions.

The survey is by Academic Impressions, which provides training conferences and webinars to higher education leaders. The survey, conducted online in June,
focused on the most typical type of endowment fund: the small kind.

The institutions in the survey raised about $3.3 billion in the last budget year, compared to the roughly $34 billion that was raised nationally by colleges in the 2013 calendar year, according to an annual survey by the Council for Aid to Education. College budget years typically end in the summer, on June 30.

About 81 percent of the colleges surveyed raised $10 million or less last year. Only 4 percent raised over $50 million.

Twenty-nine percent of advancement officials said they did not meet their fund-raising goals in the budget year that ended this summer. Still, that means most colleges did meet their target, a good sign that is echoed by other reports on giving. And the recent market rebound has grown endowments and reassured some wealthy potential donors of their ability to give.

About a fifth of the advancement professionals surveyed were at two-year colleges, 27 percent were at public four-year colleges, and 53 percent were at private four-year colleges.

The survey found that poor institutions are “getting poorer.”

“Smaller shops” – the term of art for fund-raising operations – “arguably those with the greatest resource challenges, are more likely to miss their fund raising targets,” the report concluded. “Given that alumni participation rates are steady to increasing at these institutions, the culprit is likely a decline in average gift amount -- or a too-ambitious goal.”

The smallest shops, those that raised less than $2.5 million last year, are “especially pursuing major gifts.” These fund-raising operations, mostly community colleges or small private colleges, struggled to meet their cash and pledge goals last year.

Overall, though, fund-raisers are optimistic about the future, the survey suggests. For the budget year that ends next summer, nearly 60 percent of advancement officials are looking to raise 10 percent more money from donors than they did this
year. More than a quarter of advancement officials are looking to raise 25 percent more.

Academic Impressions differed slightly from the Council for Aid to Education in finding that fund-raisers were seeing a rise in the percentage of alumni giving. The council’s survey found a decline in the alumni participation rate, which is the number of alumni donors divided by the number of alumni an institution has a means of contacting.

But the view of the author of the council’s study has been that the decrease has more to do with the ease with which colleges can now locate donors – meaning that more alumni are being contacted, so even if more are giving, the percentage could fall – rather than a newfound disinclination to give.

The Academic Impressions survey has a margin of error of plus or minus 5 percent.