JEFFERSON CITY • After months of threats, the Missouri Senate is backing off plans to cut state spending at the state’s flagship university.

A tentative budget proposal moving through a Senate committee would largely restore proposed reductions to the Mizzou system in exchange for the creation of a special panel that would offer up ways to improve operations at the troubled university.

The $750,000-per-year panel, which would have to report their recommendations by Dec. 31, was approved in the full Senate just hours before Schaefer’s budget committee began debating the overall $27.1 billion state budget.

Lawmakers worried that going along with a House plan to cut funding at the university by $7.6 million could lead to tuition increases.

“I think this is going to fall squarely on the shoulders of students,” said Sen. Dan Brown, R-Rolla.

The House version of the budget would reduce university spending as punishment for last fall’s turmoil that included student led protests over racism, an accompanying boycott by the Mizzou Tigers football team, the behavior of former communications professor Melissa Click and the departure of two top administrators.

“Clearly there are problems with how things are run,” said Sen. Kurt Schaefer, R-Columbia.
“At some point, how long are we going to kick them?” added Sen. Shalonn "Kiki" Curls, D-Kansas City. “I think we need to move forward.”

In the end, they agreed on a $1 million reduction, which could become a point of contention in future negotiations over fiscal matters with the House.

Spending at the University of Missouri and rising prescription drug costs are among the thorniest issues facing the Legislature as it works to get the budget in place by May 6.

State revenues are expected to grow by an estimated 4.1 percent in the fiscal year beginning July 1. That amounts to about $370 million in new revenue.

But, social service spending will rise by an estimated $395 million, eating up growth in other spending, such as education or prisons.

“It’s not sustainable. It’s not reasonable,” said Schaefer, pointing to a 59 percent increase in the cost of drugs for people in the Missouri HealthNet program.

Expensive "specialty drugs" designed to treat specific illnesses have driven some of the increase, but the cost of generic drugs also has risen.

Missouri HealthNet Director Joe Parks told the committee the state could reduce prescription costs by as much as $20 million through a series of savings measures being put in place.

And, he added, “We’re going to keep looking.”

Republicans said the cost of drugs must be addressed.

“If we just keep going along, there’s no way we can afford this,” said Sen. Mike Parson, R-Bolivar. “If we’re going to foot the bill, the people have the right to say, ‘How are we spending our money here?’”
Democrats said they were concerned that cuts would hurt low-income Missourians.

“We are the hardest state in the country to qualify for Medicaid,” said Curls.

Democrats also worried about the panel on the University of Missouri, saying it could be skewed with members who are all Republicans living in districts far away from the state’s main college campuses.

“I think this is a wrong-headed resolution,” said Sen. Jill Schupp, D-Creve Coeur.

Sen. Maria Chappelle-Nadal, D-University City, said she wanted at least one of the members to represent the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

Schupp and Chappelle-Nadal voted “no” on the legislation.

Sen. Jamilah Nasheed, D-St. Louis, said funding for the university should be based on performance and need, not punishment.

The proposal is Senate Concurrent Resolution 66.

Senate committee restores cuts to University of Missouri budget

By Rudi Keller

Monday, April 4, 2016 at 8:45 pm

JEFFERSON CITY — The University of Missouri and all of higher education fared far better with the Senate Appropriations Committee Monday evening than during House debate on the budget last month.
The UM System will share in $55.8 million in funding tied to performance, avoid a cut in the base allocation for the Columbia campus and suffer only a $1 million cut to taxpayer support for administration if the spending plan becomes law. Gov. Jay Nixon in September proposed the $55.8 million increase — equal to 6 percent overall for state colleges and universities — on condition that the schools freeze tuition for the coming year.

“I don’t think anyone in this process wants to do anything negative to students who pay the tuition or the staff who cuts the grass,” said committee Chairman Kurt Schaeffer, R-Columbia.

In the current fiscal year, the university was allocated $434.6 million, including $5.7 million for funding based on performance. In the coming year, the allocation would be $433.6 million plus the university’s $26.8 million share of performance funding.

The spending plan approved in the House would have cut the university’s base allocation to $426 million, with no share in performance funding. The House approved only $9.4 million for performance-based funding and wrote language denying UM a share.

Lawmakers are upset with the university over the way it handled the Concerned Student 1950 protests that included a hunger strike and a boycott of athletic events by the Missouri football team. The team threatened not to play a game against Brigham Young University, a move that would have cost the athletic department $1 million.

After UM System President Tim Wolfe resigned, the team played the game. Sen. Dan Brown, R-Rolla, said he was determined to cut from the university at one point.

“There is probably nobody madder than I was at the start of this whole thing,” Brown said. “The governing board, after a slow start, is now going in the right direction.”

The committee expects to finish work on the $27.1 billion state budget this week, with floor debate set for next week in the full Senate. The final budget figures will be set by a House-Senate conference committee.
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**UM System budget cuts await vote in the Senate**

ELLEN CAGLE, Apr 4, 2016

JEFFERSON CITY — The dust settled on legislative debate about proposed budget cuts to the University of Missouri System, at least temporarily, as appropriations bills advanced to the Senate last week.
On Tuesday, the Senate Appropriations Committee discussed, but took no action on House Bill 2003, the higher education appropriations bill that includes approximately $8.6 million in budget cuts to the UM System and MU. Sen Kurt Schaefer, R-Columbia, chairs the committee. The bill passed the House in early March with a vote of 108-46.

Since January, the General Assembly has launched a whirlwind of criticism toward the UM System. Lawmakers have denounced MU leaders' response to the racial protests that led to the November resignations of former UM System President Tim Wolfe and former MU Chancellor R. Bowen Loftin. Some legislators have said budget cuts could be the only way to spur change at MU.

These are the budgetary actions the legislature has taken so far:

By the numbers

About $7.6 million of the proposed cuts would target UM System administration. An additional $1 million would be diverted from MU to Lincoln University in Jefferson City.

In early February, a House committee also voted to exclude the UM System from a 2 percent performance-based funding increase to Missouri universities. The amendment approved by the committee would apply the increase to all state-funded Missouri universities except the four UM System campuses. The amendment differs from Gov. Jay Nixon's proposed budget, which would allow for a 6 percent increase in performance funding for all Missouri universities, which means universities could freeze tuition, Nixon has said.

UM System appropriations are divided into seven categories in this year's bill, which differs from past years. Each of the system's four campuses would receive its own appropriation, as would the University of Missouri Extension, the system's administration and a program for endowed professorships. Typically, the state has funded the UM System through a lump sum, which is then distributed to each campus by the UM System president.
For fiscal year 2016, about $220 million in state funds went toward MU's operating budget, which included funding for MU Extension. The line-items in this year's bill would allot about $216 million to those two institutions: approximately $189 million to MU and about $27 million to MU Extension.

Rep. Caleb Jones, R-Columbia, was the only Boone County House member to vote in favor of the proposed cuts. Reps. Kip Kendrick, D-Columbia, Caleb Rowden, R-Columbia, Chuck Basye, R-Rocheport, and Stephen Webber, D-Columbia, were opposed.

During House debate on the bill, Kendrick said transferring funds from MU to Lincoln University was futile and would create a "turf battle."

"It’s damaging," he said. "It doesn’t do anything to push higher education forward in this state."

MU Interim Chancellor Hank Foley announced in March that MU would face a $32 million budget shortfall for next year. Fall enrollment is expected to drop by about 1,500 students. To mitigate the loss, MU will enact a hiring freeze and a 5 percent cut to its fiscal year 2017 general revenue budget, according a memo emailed by Foley.

Up to 60 percent of the enrollment drop stems from a change in entrance standards at Illinois colleges and a decrease in Missouri high school graduates, Foley said at a March faculty meeting. He said recent campus protests also account for decreasing enrollment. A tuition increase could help combat state budget reductions, Foley said.

Funding cuts are not necessary, Rowden said, since MU will suffer from decreased enrollment. During debate on the budget bills, Rowden proposed an amendment to transfer $4.3 million from transportation funding to MU, but the House rejected his amendment.

The reasoning behind the cuts

Some legislators have said university leaders, including the UM System Board of Curators, allowed students too much leeway in the November protests.
A student activist group called Concerned Student 1950 formed last fall to protest racism at MU and a perceived lack of response from university officials to discrimination. In early November, MU graduate student Jonathan Butler began a hunger strike and said he would not eat until Wolfe stepped down. The same week, Concerned Student 1950 members began camping on MU’s campus in support of Butler and Missouri football players announced they would boycott football activities until Wolfe resigned. Wolfe resigned on Nov. 9, a week after Butler began his hunger strike.

"They need to realize that they are there to instill the occupational skills and knowledge that it takes to have our our children be able to get a job. That’s it," said Rep. J. Eggleston, R-Maysville, of university leaders during House debate on the proposed cuts. "They’re not there to treat our kids as the raw materials for some political agenda that they want the world to become."

Legislators have also condemned the actions of former assistant communications professor Melissa Click. Click provoked national controversy on the day of Wolfe's resignation when she asked for "some muscle" to prevent a student journalist from filming student demonstrations.

Rep. Tom Flanigan, R-Carthage, the chair of Select Committee on Budget, proposed cutting about $400,000 from MU's budget in late February, in addition to the $7.6 million to system administration, an amount equivalent to Click's salary and two of her superiors. The next week, the budget committee rejected the proposal following a vote by the Board of Curators to fire Click.

However, criticism of Click has not abated since her firing. During House debate, several legislators said Click's actions were a reason to cut funding.

"We cannot reward bad behavior. We cannot reward lack of leadership at MU," said House Speaker Pro Tem Denny Hoskins, R-Warrensburg, referencing Click.

Kendrick said that the legislature has been distracted by Click's behavior.
"I believe that we’ve spent more time in the last few months talking about Melissa Click than we have spent talking about the important issues that face our state," he said. "And I’m starting to wonder if Melissa Click is the reason why our infrastructure is in disrepair."

Other legislators have said MU has failed to address racism on campus.

"Mizzou has always shown that they don't have respect for minorities," said Rep. Courtney Allen Curtis, D-Ferguson, during House debate. "But (leaders) are responsive to the cuts. Sometimes when you’re talking to people, the only thing they understand is money."

MISSOURIAN

Senate committee agrees to restore UM funding cuts, approves oversight group

ELLEN CAGLE, 9 hrs ago

JEFFERSON CITY — The legislature's efforts to bolster oversight of the University of Missouri System veered Monday when a Senate committee decided against cutting the system's funds and passed a resolution to review the system's organization.

Although the Senate Appropriations Committee did not take an official vote on any funding measures, it agreed to reduce proposed funding cuts to UM System administration from about $7.6 million to $1 million. The committee, which is chaired by Sen. Kurt Schaefer, R-Columbia, also decided to restore $1 million to MU that the House previously voted last month to route to Lincoln University.

The committee also granted state-funded universities a 6 percent performance-based funding increase, up from the 2 percent approved by the House. The increase would total $55.8 million, matching Gov. Jay Nixon's proposed budget and allowing for a tuition freeze. The UM System's inclusion in the funding increase reverses the House's previous decision to exclude the system's four campuses.
Schaefer advocated the UM System's inclusion in performance funding increases. Excluding the system could prompt a tuition increase, he said.

In the appropriations meeting, the committee was riven on how much to reduce the $7.6 million cut approved by the House. Since January, legislators have criticized the way MU leaders responded to protests about racism on campus that led to the resignation of former UM System President Tim Wolfe and former MU Chancellor R Bowen Loftin.

Sen. Rob Schaaf, R-St. Joseph, said some kind of penalty was necessary.

"They misbehaved, and the only thing that we have is the purse strings to hurt them a little bit and let them take notice," Schaaf said. "So make it noticeable to them."

Schaaf reminded the committee that Missouri's football team announced a boycott of football activities days before Wolfe stepped down. Had the boycott continued into the following weekend, MU would have had to pay Brigham Young University $1 million for canceling a game.

"My feeling is that they ought to at least be cut that million dollars," Schaaf said. "By their own words, that's a just and fair punishment."

Others argued that slashing funding as punishment would cause undue harm to the university system.

"I don't think we should be in that type of business here," said Sen. Jamilah Nasheed, D-St. Louis. "Let's look at the merits. Let's look at if they're performing well."

Sen. Gina Walsh, D-St. Louis, agreed.

"We are punishing the other campuses ... not just Mizzou," she said. "We've talked this to death. I think it's time to get back to work."
Sen. Mike Parson, R-Bolivar, questioned what the original $7.6 million administration cut would affect. Legislative budget analysts said the cuts would target the administration system office, including human resources and information technology services.

Schaefer said the House and Senate will meet in a conference committee to find agreements between the different versions of the appropriations bill.

Earlier on Monday, the Senate gave its initial approval to the Schaefer-sponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, which would create the University of Missouri System Review Commission. This commission would review items including the University of Missouri Collected Rules and Regulations, administrative structure, degree programs, research activities and diversity programs. Four representatives and four senators appointed by the speaker of the House and the Senate president pro tem, respectively, would make up the commission.

Schaefer said his resolution to review the UM System would suffice as a way to monitor the university system's improvement, and he criticized the UM Board of Curators, which is tasked with overseeing the system.

"This body is responsible for half a billion dollars that (the system) gets of taxpayers money," Schaefer said. The curators "have shown recently that they don't make the most stellar decisions in the face of conflict."

Recommended changes to the system based on the review would be presented to the legislature in December. The university system's failure to comply with any suggested changes could affect future appropriations.

The resolution passed with a vote of 28-2. Sens. Maria Chappelle-Nadal, D-St. Louis, and Jill Schupp, D-Creve Coeur, opposed the measure.
Forums start as University of Missouri looks for president

COLUMBIA, Mo. (AP) — The leadership board for the four-campus University of Missouri system wants to find out what the public wants from the system’s next president.

The forums are being held at each of the campuses. The first two are Monday, with one at the Missouri University of Science and Technology in Rolla and the other at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

The Board of Curators also is planning a forum Wednesday at the system's flagship campus in Columbia and another Friday at the University of Missouri-Kansas City.

Mike Middleton is leading the university system on an interim basis. Curators asked Middleton to take the position after system president Tim Wolfe resigned amid controversy about race-related protests on the Columbia campus.

Rolla forum draws 70 to discuss University of Missouri presidential search

ROLLA — The sweeper on a curling team clears obstacles from the ice so the stone can glide easily to its goal. The next president of the University of Missouri should similarly excel at helping others be successful, the student member of the Presidential Search Committee said Monday.
“This person must be a sweeper,” Rakeem Golden, a sociology major at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, said during the first forum to discuss the qualifications for a new president. “They must get out in front and make way for faculty, staff and students.”

The search committee includes Golden and is led by attorney Cheryl Walker, a former curator, and Jim Whitaker, an orthopedic surgeon from Kansas City. It also includes two faculty representatives and a staff representative as well as the UM System Board of Curators and the student representative to the curators.

The forum in the Havener Center at Missouri University of Science and Technology drew about 70 people — mainly administrators, faculty and students. For about an hour, attendees spoke about the personality traits, educational and professional background and political skills necessary for a new UM System leader.

Golden’s comment provided a new perspective on the role of the president and has merit, said Pam Henrickson, chairwoman of the UM Board of Curators. The process already has identified a number of traits that university stakeholders consider important, she said.

“Clearly if we tried to satisfy all the requirements, that man hasn’t been born yet,” Henrickson said.

Walker and Whitaker said Golden’s analogy describes an important leadership trait.

“A good leader identifies a target, identifies qualified people, gives them whatever they need and then lets them go,” Whitaker said. “I hadn’t thought of it like that, but I agree.”

UM leaders held a second forum Monday afternoon at the University of Missouri-St. Louis campus. A third forum is set for 10:30 a.m. Wednesday at the Reynolds Alumni Center in Columbia, and a final forum will take place Friday at UMKC.

Kelley Stuck, interim vice president for human resources, said 25 meetings about the presidential search had been conducted with campus and alumni groups. The forums are a chance for the public to be involved in the process, Stuck said.

The forums are intended to help the committee and consulting firm Isaacson, Miller Inc. develop the application package by identifying the attributes to be graded as candidates are considered. The committee will also recommend the finalists to the board for a selection late this year.

The committee is seeking candidates to replace Tim Wolfe, who resigned Nov. 9 amid protests over racial issues on the Columbia campus and administrative infighting with campus leaders. Interim President Mike Middleton on several occasions has said he is not interested in the permanent role.

The university is paying Isaacson, Miller Inc. $150,000 plus expenses for its services.
Sahra Sedigh, an associate professor of electrical and computer engineering, said the next president should have crisis-management skills.

“I don’t think it will be hard to find someone with a reputation to solve conflict that keeps the university’s reputation intact,” she said.

Wolfe, a Columbia native and graduate of MU, was president of Novell Americas — a computer network software supplier — but did not have an advanced degree or experience in academic administration. Ming Leu, a professor of mechanical and aerospace engineering, said experience with academia is as important as a history of dealing with industry and political leaders.

Candidates “should have good research and teaching experiences in the past in order to gain the respect and support of faculty members of the campus,” Leu said.

The next president also needs to focus on the entire system rather than only the Columbia campus, said George Holmes, a senior studying mechanical engineering.

“When people think of the UM system, they think of” MU, Holmes said. “A lot of people don’t know that Rolla exists. We need a president who will really be a cheerleader for all of the campuses.”

Senate approves commission to study University of Missouri administration

By Rudi Keller

Monday, April 4, 2016 at 8:13 pm

JEFFERSON CITY — The University of Missouri would be required to implement recommendations of an eight-member review commission or face possible budget cuts next year, the Missouri Senate decided Monday.

The Senate voted 28-2 to approve a proposal from Sen. Kurt Schaefer, R-Columbia, to look at the university’s rules, administration, campus structure and auxiliary enterprises as well as degree programs, research and diversity efforts.

The commission is Schaefer’s response, in part, to the turmoil on the Columbia campus this past fall that culminated in the resignation of UM System President Tim Wolfe during demonstrations
over racial issues. Other issues roiling the campus included changes in graduate assistant health insurance, faculty teaching waivers, administrative infighting and ties to the Planned Parenthood clinic in Columbia.

“What we are trying to do with this is acknowledge there were some failures in what happened last fall,” Schaefer said.

The Missouri House on March 10 approved a higher education spending bill that included cuts to the UM budget. The House froze the university out of a pool for increasing state aid to public colleges and universities and cut $8.6 million from its operating allocation for the year starting July 1.

The commission’s recommendations are due by Dec. 31. If the curators fail to implement them, that lack of action “shall be considered by the General Assembly during the appropriations process,” the resolution states.

The resolution intrudes on the constitutional responsibility of the Board of Curators, Sen. Jill Schupp, D-Creve Couer, said during debate. Schupp and Sen. Maria Chappelle-Nadal, D-St. Louis, were the only lawmakers to oppose the resolution.

Schupp sought to make adoption of the recommendations optional.

We're overstepping "the constitutional governing body of the university by putting into place this task force,” Schupp said. “I don’t think it is appropriate.”

Directing the curators to implement the recommendations or face sanctions is appropriate because the state gives the university about $500 million annually, Schaefer said.

It is wrong “to imply that we should always defer to the … curators, who have shown they don’t have a stellar record,” Schaefer said.

Schupp also objected to language in the resolution granting authority to appoint commission members to Senate President Pro Tem Ron Richard, R-Joplin, and House Speaker Todd Richardson, R-Poplar Bluff. Her amendment also tried to give one appointment each to Democratic legislative leaders to ensure the commission was bipartisan.

The amendment was defeated on a voice vote.

Members of the commission would not be lawmakers. The resolution directs that members show expertise in governance, finance and school leadership as well as a “demonstrated understanding of and commitment to the University of Missouri System and to the important role that the University has in the past, present, and future of the State of Missouri.”

A major part of the commission’s work would be to determine whether the university is being run efficiently, Schaefer said.
The Senate Appropriations Committee set aside $750,000 for the commission's work during budget hearings Monday evening.

“This is a big-picture, 30,000-foot view," Schaefer said. "At least the way I see it."

Missouri Senate approves panel to review University of Missouri rules

JEFFERSON CITY • State senators have voted to create a commission to review the University of Missouri System's policies and administrative structure.

Lawmakers voted 28-2 Monday to form the panel, which will recommend changes by the end of the year.

Lawmakers have criticized how the school handled student protests over administrators' perceived indifference to racism at the Columbia campus.

Sen. Kurt Schaefer says the commission would help the school re-evaluate how its rules constrain its leaders. He says there will always be activism on college campuses, and the public needs to know administrators can react to it appropriately.

The Republican House speaker and the Senate president pro tem will appoint the commission members.

Sen. Jill Schupp said Democrats should have the opportunity to appoint members.

The measure now goes to the House.
Spike Lee's film on campus activism to premiere Wednesday at Missouri Theatre

LIZ RAMOS, Updated 17 hrs ago

COLUMBIA — A Spike Lee short documentary, "2 Fists Up," will cast the spotlight on Concerned Student 1950 and the MU football team.

"2 Fists Up" will premiere at 8 p.m. Wednesday at the Missouri Theatre. It is part of "Spike Lee's Lil' Joints," Lee's ESPN digital short series. The premiere is free and open to the public.

The 30-minute documentary explains the impact of the Black Lives Matter movement on the protests against racism on MU's campus last semester.

Lee was in Columbia to watch the "Concerned Student 1950" documentary at the True/False Film Fest on March 5.

After the debut of the film, directed by MU students Varun Bajaj, Kellan Marvin and Adam Dietrich, Lee took a few minutes to speak to them about their film and their involvement with the group, Dietrich said.

Bajaj, Marvin and Dietrich licensed some of their footage to Lee for his documentary.

"It's exciting," Dietrich said. "We had a lot of conversations on our end about how comfortable we were with how much to give him and what his producers wanted."

On March 7, Lee shot video of Concerned Student 1950 confronting Chuck Henson, MU interim vice chancellor for inclusion, diversity and equity, after Henson sent a letter asking them to stop making demands to change the racial climate on campus.
With Lee's documentary, Dietrich said, more people will be involved in the conversation about racism.

"I think it just takes everything to another level," Dietrich said. "It's a broader audience of people that will care about it."

The film will also be shown at the Tribeca Film Festival in New York April 21-23, festival publicist Lauren Kleiman said.

MU hatches "exciting" study on chicken farming

COLUMBIA - A discovery made on a Missouri farm is inspiring research that could mean more chickens on the market and more cash in farmers' pockets.

An MU study is being conducted by professor Leon Schumacher and the MU School of Agricultural Systems Management, and stems from an effort to make a chicken farm made improvements by installing LED lights in the barn.

"We were down to Versailles, Missouri, and we noticed that, after we made some energy efficient updates to a broiler facility, the birds were actually coming to market five to seven days sooner than otherwise," Schumacher said.

He said, although five to seven days may not seem like a large time period, the impact over a year can be massive.

"Three percent more birds were coming to market," Schumacher said. "So if you start doing the math on that, three percent of a million birds is a lot more birds coming to market. So that's the idea behind the whole deal."
Research Assistant A.J. Feicht said he thinks the study could bring a substantial financial gain for farmers.

"If farmers are able to raise more birds per year in their same facilities, obviously they're taking more to market and that means quite a bit more cash flow in their pocket."

MU's study is segregating the birds to different pens, each with a different source of LED lighting. The study is using natural colored lighting, green lighting, blue lighting and red lighting, and studying how the birds react.

Schumacher said studies like this have been done before, but MU's has a unique characteristic.

"There have been times when people have tried to use blue lighting, green lighting, red lighting and natural daylight," Schumacher said. "The interesting part about that is none of that work was completed with an LED light source, it was completed with some kind of a filter on a bulb."

Schumacher and his assistants are monitoring things like the feeding efficiency of the birds, rate of weight gain, mortality rate, behavior in the light source and possible gene reaction in response to the LED lighting.

However, lessening the time it takes for chickens to come to market is not the only positive effect this study could have.

Schumacher said the energy savings from LED bulbs cannot be overlooked.

"Our whole society is just using more energy," Schumacher said. "If we can reduce the amount of energy for the same operation, it saves us money, but it also saves energy."

Schumacher also says LED light bulbs effect people as well, even if it isn't noticeable.

"A fluorescent light emits kind of a pulse," Schumacher said. "You don't see it, you don't feel it, but it's actually turning off and on frequently, more than we can possibly imagine. That said, that flicker causes us to behave in certain ways. And so you're going to say, does that make a difference? What I do know is that if I have LED lighting in place of fluorescent lighting, I'm a happier guy. It's sounds kind of crazy but I really am."

For farmer Dustin Stanton, both possible benefits of the study are exciting.

"If you can have a ten percent increase in your flock over an entire year, that's huge. That's something you just can't get every day," Stanton said. Also at the same time with LED you cut the cost of energy used per month and that's also a huge benefit."

Stanton said he has actually switched over to LED lighting in his chicken barns, and noticed his bill was nearly cut in half.
Feicht said the thought that this study could bring a lasting, positive change to chicken farmers around the country is humbling and important.

"It's pretty exciting," Feicht said. "It's always cool to think, 'What if I could change the world?' so to speak. Which in reality not a lot of people are going to change the world. Not that I think I'm going to change the world or be involved with something that's going to change the world, but if you can change the way somebody does something for the better, that's a pretty cool feeling."

Schumacher said the switch to LED bulbs could be a small change with a big impact.

"The ultimate goal of agriculture in the next few years, everyone's concerned about if we're going to have enough food and protein by the year 2050. If the LED light would help us accomplish that then I think we better start changing a lot of LED light bulbs."

Will You Sprint, Stroll or Stumble Into a Career?

At the age of 18, G. Stanley Hall left his home in the tiny village of Ashfield, Mass., for Williams College, just 35 miles away, with a goal to “do something and be something in the world.” His mother wanted him to become a minister, but the young Stanley wasn’t sure about that plan. He saw a four-year degree as a chance to explore.

Though Hall excelled at Williams, his parents, who were farmers, considered his undergraduate years a bit erratic. He didn’t think he had the requirements for a pastor, but nonetheless enrolled in Union Theological Seminary in New York after graduation. The big city was intoxicating, and living there persuaded him to abandon his religious studies. After securing a loan, he set off for Germany to study philosophy, travel and visit the theaters, bars and dance halls of Berlin.

“What exactly are you doing over there?” his father sternly asked. Hall added physiology and physics to his academic pursuits and told his parents he was thinking about getting a Ph.D. in philosophy. “Just what is a Doctor of Philosophy?” his mother wanted to know.

His parents wanted him to come home and get a real job, and even Hall, having “scarcely tried my hand in the world to know where I can do anything,” wondered what was next. He was out of money and in debt, so he returned home after his parents refused to support him financially. He was 27 years old.

Hall’s story is similar to that of many young Americans today. They go off to college, resist pressures to choose a job-connected major, then drift after graduation, often short of money and
any real plan. But here’s the difference: Stanley Hall grew up in a totally different America, the one of the mid-1800s.

We think this kind of lengthy takeoff is relatively new, but even in the 19th and early 20th centuries, when the economy offered fewer career choices, there were college graduates who roamed through their third decade of life. Hall was an outlier, of course, as most of his generation launched into adulthood right after high school, if they even went. But his story might serve to lessen the anxiety of today’s parents about their own children’s long stumble toward independence: Stanley Hall went on to great success.

He eventually earned an advanced degree in psychology, taught at Antioch College, Harvard and Johns Hopkins and became president of Clark University in Massachusetts, where he developed a fascination with the period in life between childhood and adulthood. He founded the American Psychological Association and in 1904 wrote an influential book about a new life stage he called “adolescence.”

Hall described this transitional period — between ages 14 and 24 — as full of “storm and stress.” But in reality, the adolescent stage in the early 1900s was much shorter than Hall imagined. Teenagers were able to get a solid full-time job right after high school, followed quickly by marriage and parenthood. It wasn’t until around the middle of the last century that the job market began requiring that a college degree be added to the equation, and with the G.I. Bill allowing returning World War II veterans to go for free, enrollments boomed.

That postwar era cemented in our minds an idea that remains to this day: Teenagers graduate from high school, earn a college degree, secure a job, and move out of their childhood home — all by the age of 22 or so.

But by the 1960s, as Americans started spending more time in college, the trend of a relatively quick launch to adulthood was ending. Census figures show that the number of 19- to 24-year-olds living with their parents started edging up, from 30 percent in 1960, to 35 percent in 1980, to 47 percent today.

The difference between the “boomerang generation” of the 1960s and 1970s and now is that manufacturing was still the foundation of the economy, allowing more than one pathway to solid middle-class jobs. The 1970s marked the last full decade when a large slice of the population didn’t need a college degree for financial success. The recession of the early 1980s effectively killed off manufacturing, and with the next decade’s technology revolution, the wage premium for attending college started to speed up, turning into a runaway train. In 1983, the wage premium — how much more a typical bachelor’s degree recipient earns compared to a high school graduate — was 42 percent. Today, it surpasses 80 percent.

The huge run-up in the number of undergraduate and graduate students — eight million more than in 1980, according to the National Center for Education Statistics — has led to further delays in passing the milestones of adulthood, forever changing how we view the transition from education to the work force. In the 1980s, college graduates achieved financial independence, defined as reaching the median wage, by the time they turned 26, according to Georgetown
University’s Center on Education and the Workforce. In 2014, they didn’t hit that mark until their 30th birthday.

In the 1990s, Jeffrey Jenson Arnett, a psychology professor at the University of Missouri, interviewed young people around the country and determined that his subjects felt both grown up and not quite so grown up at exactly the same time. This led Dr. Arnett to conclude that the period between 18 and 25 was a distinct stage separate from both adolescence and young adulthood. In 2000, he published a paper defining this slice of life as “emerging adulthood,” a phrase that immediately entered the cultural lexicon, especially for parents trying to figure out why their children were struggling to launch into adulthood.

“Emerging adulthood is a time of life when many different directions remain possible,” Dr. Arnett wrote, “when little about the future has been decided for certain, when the scope of independent exploration of life’s possibilities is greater for most people than it will be at any other period of the life course.”

By the time I caught up with Dr. Arnett, he had moved to Clark University. In the fall of 2014, 14 years after he had coined the term, I was curious whether the journey to adulthood was getting even longer.

“Absolutely,” he said. “The changes that are happening are permanent structural changes that have only sped up all over the world.” The biggest change, he said, is the move to an information economy that requires even more education and job-hopping in one’s 20s.

For today’s emerging adults, Dr. Arnett told me, a college degree may be the biggest determinant of whether they launch into a sustaining career, but it is not the only factor that separates the successful from the drifters. If that were the case, recent graduates wouldn’t be standing in the unemployment line or settling for jobs that don’t require a bachelor’s degree. It’s how they navigate their college years that matters the most.

In the journey to adulthood, they are either Sprinters, Wanderers or Stragglers.

The story continues: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/04/10/education/edlife/will-you-sprint-stroll-or-stumble-into-a-career.html?_r=1
PRINCETON, N.J. (AP) — Woodrow Wilson's name will remain on Princeton University's public policy school, despite calls to remove it because the former U.S. president was a segregationist, the Ivy League university announced Monday.

Princeton was challenged to take a deeper look into Wilson's life in the fall, when a group of students raised questions about his racist views. The Black Justice League held a 32-hour sit-in inside Princeton President Christopher Eisgruber's office, demanding Wilson's name be removed from programs and buildings, including the Woodrow Wilson School of Public Policy and International Affairs, and for other changes to make the university more diverse and inclusive.

Eisgruber said the process helped him learn more about one of Princeton's most celebrated alumni and presidents.

"The students should recognize they have really changed the way people will talk about and remember Wilson," said Eisgruber, a 1983 Princeton alumnus. "All the people whom we honor in history are going to be people with flaws and deficiencies. If we
made that argument for not honoring people, we would honor nobody. The right attitude is to honor people, but be honest about their failings."

University leaders concluded that Wilson's accomplishments merited commemoration, so long as his faults also are candidly recognized. Princeton also pledged to adopt other changes, including establishing a pipeline program to encourage more minority students to pursue doctoral degrees and diversifying campus symbols and art.

Wilson was president of Princeton from 1902 to 1910, and the country's 28th president from 1913 until 1921. The Democrat is credited with creating the Federal Reserve system, led the U.S. into World War I and tried to preserve a lasting peace afterward. He won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1919 for being the architect of the League of Nations.

But he also supported segregation — including in the federal government — rolling back progress for the emerging black middle class in the nation's capital at the turn of the 20th century. As president of Princeton, he also prevented the enrollment of black students.

The debate over Wilson's name was part of a wave of racially motivated activism on college campuses across the country this school year that began with protests at the University of Missouri. There, black students — including members of the school's football team — successfully protested for the ouster of Missouri’s president.

In recent months, college leaders have moved to change mascots, building names, mottos and other symbols some have deemed offensive or outdated.

At Princeton, a 10-member committee looked at Wilson's legacy and the state of race relations on campus. It gathered input from Wilson scholars and more than 600 submissions from alumni, faculty and the public.
In the end, the committee concluded Wilson's accomplishments were among "the reason's Wilson's name was associated with the school and the college," but added that some of his views "clearly contradict with the values we hold today."

Using his name "implies no endorsement of views and actions that conflict with the values and aspirations of our times," the committee report read. "We have said that in this report, and the university must say it in the settings that bear his name."

Eisgruber, the university's president, said Princeton has an obligation to highlight not only Wilson's "towering achievements," but also his "severe deficiencies."

"We have to be cognizant about the kinds of harms people even of great achievement caused," Eisgruber said. "Princeton was an exclusive place for a very long time. We need to be honest about those exclusions ... and make sure we create symbols on campus that make people feel that this is a place they can call home."

Eric Yellin, a University of Richmond history professor and a Wilson biographer who served as a member of the committee, told The Associated Press that the debate about Wilson has sparked deeper questions.

"It's really important not to take Wilson's racism and put it in the category of 'everybody was a racist,'" Yellin said. "Not everybody was president, or as articulate about why segregation was important. Not everybody had the same number of opportunities to change the world."

The board of trustees' decision came on the same day that the school opened an interactive exhibit putting Wilson in context for his era while emphasizing that he was a man apart from it — for better and worse. "In the Nation's Service? Wilson Revisited" will run through Oct. 28.
His faults are laid bare from the beginning of the exhibit. One panel quotes him: "Segregation is not a humiliation but a benefit, and ought to be so regarded by you gentlemen."

Daniel Linke, archivist at the Seeley G. Mudd Manuscript Library at Princeton and curator of the exhibit, said: "What we were trying to do here is take the line that separates 'Wilson good' and 'Wilson bad' and expand it."
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Nearly Half of Students Are Open to Free-Speech Restrictions on Campuses, Survey Finds

Nearly half of college students believe in curtailing the news media’s access to campus events in certain scenarios, such as when protesters want to be left alone (48 percent), when they believe a reporter will be biased (49 percent), and when they want to tell the story themselves on social media (44 percent), a new Gallup survey has found.

The survey, financed by John S. and James L. Knight Foundation and the Newseum Institute, examined college students’ perceptions of the security of their First Amendment rights on campuses and their views of the news media and social media.

College students are confident in the protections afforded to them by the First Amendment, much more so than a majority of American adults, the survey found. That divide is most prominent in views on freedom of speech (56 percent among adults vs. 73 percent among students), freedom of the press (64 percent vs. 81 percent), and freedom to petition the government (58 percent vs. 76 percent).
While more than 75 percent of students believe colleges should expose students to all types of speech and viewpoints, a majority of students believe campus climates prevent people from saying what they believe out of fears of offending others.

Fifty-nine percent of students are also critical of the news media’s ability to fairly and accurately report the news, while views on social media vary. Eight in 10 students in the survey agreed that social media allows people to have control of their own story and to express their views. Less than half of students, though, said that conversations on social media are civil, and 74 percent believe it’s too easy to hide behind anonymity.

Students’ skepticism of the news media was highlighted during the turmoil at the University of Missouri at Columbia last fall, when some people tried to limit reporters’ access to an encampment of protesters, and instead tell the story on social media.