



**MU News Bureau**

*Daily Clips Packet*

August 11, 2017

# ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

## Mizzou medical school will produce more doctors to address shortage

By Blythe Bernhard St. Louis Post-Dispatch

**Not all enrollment trends at the University of Missouri-Columbia are down — the medical school has increased its class size by one-third this year.**

The expansion, to a class of 128 from 96, is aimed at addressing a looming physician shortage created by an aging population. Most of Missouri is considered to have a shortage of health professionals, particularly rural parts of the state. The state needs an additional 367 doctors to accommodate its population, according to Kaiser Family Foundation data.

In 2006, the Association of American Medical Colleges recommended medical schools increase their enrollments by 30 percent in the following decade. The same year, St. Louis University increased the number of first-year students to 175 from 150, making it the largest medical school in the state.

Washington University's medical school enrollment has stayed between 120 and 124 students per class. There are no plans to increase the size of the class, which is partly influenced by the number of faculty and available space, according to the dean of admissions.

Mizzou started looking at expanding its class size soon after the 2006 recommendations, said Weldon Webb, an associate dean.

"We're the No. 1 provider of practicing physicians in Missouri, so if somebody was going to increase, it should probably be Columbia," he said.

The expansion of the medical school includes a new \$42.5 million classroom and laboratory building on the Columbia campus. A clinical campus opened last year in Springfield where some third- and fourth-year students train, aided by a partnership with CoxHealth and Mercy hospitals. About 44 percent of the medical school's students stay in Missouri after graduation, Webb said.

The growth of the medical school contrasts with undergraduate enrollment in Columbia, which dropped by about 14 percent this fall. The incoming class of about 4,000 freshmen is the smallest in nearly 20 years.

Reports of racism and a lack of diversity at Mizzou contributed to the drop in undergraduate enrollment and have also caused troubles for the medical school.

The medical school's credentials are at risk if it doesn't train more minority doctors, according to a 2016 report from the Liaison Committee on Medical Education, the accrediting organization for U.S. medical schools. The committee previously cited the school for its lack of diversity in 2001 and 2008.

The committee's most recent recommendations give the school until 2018 to increase the number of black, Hispanic and Native American medical students, among other requirements.

Last year, less than 4 percent of Mizzou's medical students belonged to one of the three underrepresented minority groups, according to national data. In the incoming class, 9 percent of students identify as black, Hispanic or Native American, school officials said.

The increased diversity of the incoming class tops St. Louis University, where 7 percent of medical students are in the three minority groups. The accrediting body placed SLU's medical school on a two-year probation in February in part for its problems recruiting and retaining low-income and first-generation students.

Washington University's rate of underrepresented minority medical students is 9 percent. University of Missouri-Kansas City has the state's most diverse medical student body, with 12 percent.

Ebony Page of St. Louis joined Mizzou's class of 2021 because of the medical school's growth and the opportunities to work in underserved communities after graduation, she said.

"For me, growing up in the inner city and knowing the health disparities, a lot of it has to do with access to care," said Page, 27. "To see the shortage firsthand made it important to go to an institution where it was important to them."



## [Women with high levels of cadmium at higher risk for endometrial cancer](#)

Watch the Story: <http://www.komu.com/news/women-with-high-levels-of-cadmium-at-higher-risk-for-endometrial-cancer>

**COLUMBIA - Researchers at the University of Missouri found that women with increased levels of cadmium had an increased risk of endometrial cancer. Cadmium is a metal that is found in kidneys, liver, shellfish and tobacco.**

Associate professor Jane McElroy said cadmium has the same effects on the body as a key hormone.

"Endometrial cancer has been associated with estrogen exposure," she said. "Because cadmium mimics estrogen, it may lead to an increased growth of the endometrium, contributing to an increased risk of endometrial cancer."

McElroy said cadmium is unavoidable, but people can control their exposure.

"So we're all exposed to Cadmium and where it comes from is from production and deposition of NiCad batteries," McElroy said. "That's the primary source, but it's in lots and lots of things. It's in paints. It's in industrial processes as well as natural processes."

Cadmium is in the air and then gets deposited in the soil and into plants.

"We eat the plants or we eat the animals who eat the plants," McElroy said. "Similarly, it's also deposited in the water and then the creatures in the water eat the plants that are in the water and each other and then it's uptake in the animals."

Humans take in cadmium through food and smoking.

"So our source is food," McElroy said. "That's the primary source for people who aren't occupationally exposed. Then the second source is smoking, because, when you smoke, it's that plant and so then it's the same process. It's deposited in the plant. The plants uptake the cadmium and then we burn the plants, tobacco plants."

There was a direct relation between the amount of cadmium and the risk of endometrial cancer.

"The finding was that we had a 22 percent increase with a doubling of cadmium," McElroy said. "So for every doubling of an amount of cadmium that we found in your urine, you were at an 22 percent increased risk for getting endometrial cancer."



## University Responds to NAACP Advisory Against Travel to Missouri

By KELLYN ALISE NETTLES & THE COLUMBIA MISSOURIAN

An NAACP advisory warning people of color against traveling to Missouri has generated no shortage of reactions.

In June, the Missouri chapter of the civil rights organization issued a statement warning African Americans to avoid the state based on a law tightening discrimination safeguards and a number of recent racial incidents. The advisory said people of color should be aware of "looming danger" and should travel through the state with "extreme caution."

The advisory cited the enactment of Senate Bill 43, which makes it more difficult to prove discrimination in lawsuits. **It also referred to racial incidents that took place on the MU campus and the death of Tory Sanford, who died in a southeast Missouri jail, though he was never arrested.**

MU officials and groups reacted with statements about the university's progress. UM System President Mun Choi sent an email to students and staff Monday morning saying he was disappointed to hear about the advisory. He said he reached out to NAACP President Rod Chapel to gain a mutual understanding.

"We all share a commitment to create a community that values the diversity of background, experiences, perspectives and thought," Choi wrote. "At the University of Missouri System, my colleagues have made remarkable progress toward this objective."

MU Chancellor Alexander Cartwright addressed a statement to "anyone who interacts with MU students" on Thursday. In the statement, Cartwright listed potential talking points identifying actions the university has taken since the fall of 2015, when protests over race relations put MU in the spotlight. MU has created a Division of Inclusion, Diversity and Equity, trained students, faculty and staff on diversity issues and increased efforts to hire more diverse faculty and staff.

"We recognize this is a national issue, and we've been out front on this for the past year and a half," one of Cartwright's talking points states. "Mizzou continues to expand its reach."

The Legion of Black Collegians, the only black student government in the nation, issued a statement about the advisory on its Twitter page.

"We are aware of the current travel advisory issued by the NAACP for Missouri," the statement said. "However, we are and will be working tirelessly to ensure that our students feel protected and to promote safety for not only Black people, but all who are marginalized and oppressed."

Tracy Wilson-Kleekamp, president of Race Matters, Friends, said she has received numerous calls from people planning to visit Columbia to observe the upcoming eclipse, asking whether or not it would be safe to travel to the city. She said she believes Columbia has a leadership problem, and she pointed to [data](#) from the Missouri attorney general stating that African Americans are 3.9 times more likely to be stopped by Columbia police.

"One would wonder if the people who are in denial about that data, if this bothers them or not," Wilson-Kleekamp said. "To most people of color, this is not a news flash."

Megan McConachie, Columbia Convention and Visitors Bureau strategic communications manager, said the bureau had not received any calls from the public about the advisory, and Columbia has always and will be promoted as a welcoming city. The Jefferson City Convention and Visitors Bureau said that it had no comment. Many city officials, including Columbia Mayor Brian Treece, did not respond to requests for comment.

Berkley Hudson, MU journalism professor and chair of the Faculty Council's Diversity Enhancement Committee, believes the issues aren't just happening here. Missouri is just a border state, he said, both in geography and in political history.

"It's a place that's dealing with these issues in a real up-front, public way with the spotlight on it," Hudson said. "If (people) think they're going to avoid these problems by going somewhere else, they're fooling themselves."

Hudson served as chair of the university's Race Relations Committee, formed in the spring of 2015. He said the committee created a model to help students and faculty listen to one another and understand other people's views. He believes the NAACP advisory creates a climate of action.

"It's the perfect place for all of these issues to come to the forefront," Hudson said. "It's the perfect place for MU to be a leader in the place of race relations, but that's very difficult work. There are students, staff and alumni working on this every day."

"Somehow, we have to all come together as Mizzou, as Missouri, as a nation," Hudson continued. "And we have to grapple with it. I do think we can follow our mission of respect, discovery, responsibility and excellence at Mizzou and learn to listen to each other."

# MISSOURIAN

## **UMKC chancellor leaving early; likely interim backs more system collaboration**

EDWARD MCKINLEY

COLUMBIA — **A vocal advocate at a July curators retreat for improved system teamwork is likely to become interim chancellor at the University of Missouri-Kansas City.**

**UM System President Mun Choi will formally request that UMKC Provost Barbara Bichelmeyer be named as interim chancellor after Chancellor Leo Morton departs, Choi wrote in a Wednesday email to system staff. Morton had planned to leave after this school year, but he is taking a job as chief operating officer for DeBruce Companies in Kansas City and will leave the school in October.**

The UM System president does not have the authority to appoint a chancellor so his recommendation is subject to approval from the UM System Board of Curators.

At a July 19 curators retreat, Bichelmeyer led a presentation about "system-ness" to board members and administrators from throughout the system, including new MU Chancellor Alexander Cartwright.

Throughout the presentation, and in discussions during other presentations at the two-day retreat, system and campus officials emphasized the need for the four schools to work together more.

Increased cooperation among the system schools is part of Choi's strategy, MU Spokesman Christian Basi said. Choi is specifically pushing to make sure the schools are cooperating so they can use their resources more effectively and avoid duplication, Basi said.

Although many agree the campuses could work together more, some say it's still important for MU to retain its status as a flagship campus.

Karen Piper, an MU English professor and member of the MU Faculty Council, said she thinks the state legislature prefers more of a system approach because it considers MU to be too liberal and doesn't trust the university for this reason.

Although she may disagree on those points, Piper agreed that increased "system-ness" is good as long as it doesn't detract from MU's status as the flagship.

At the retreat, Bichelmeyer described the four campuses — UMKC, Missouri State University of Science and Technology, University of Missouri-St. Louis and MU — as a family. She said anything affecting one campus causes a ripple to hit the others. She said she saw an impact at UMKC from the 2015 protests at MU.

Piper has a different take on it: UMSL, Missouri S&T and UMKC have some level of envy for MU's status as a respected research university.

At the retreat, Bichelmeyer compared the situation to the response of a mother asked by her children who she loves most: "I love you each sufficient to your needs."

Bichelmeyer came to UMKC from the Indiana University system, where she worked from 1996 to 2015.

MU's new chancellor also brings a strong sense of system synergy. Before coming to MU, Cartwright worked for the 64-school State University of New York, the largest university system in the nation.



## Thinking Out Loud: Eclipse 101 with Dr. Angela Speck

By DARREN HELLWEGE & TREVOR HARRIS

The total solar eclipse is now less than two weeks away. On this week's Thinking Out Loud, Darren Hellwege talked with Dr. Angela Speck about the science behind the eclipse.

Also on the program, Professor Emeritus of Physics Dr. H.R. Chandrasekhar shares an ancient Hindu explanation for the eclipse. [Listen here.](#)



## MU president wishes to increase partnership with Northwest

**University of Missouri President Dr. Mun Choi visited Northwest Missouri State University for the first time August 3 and later met with community members during a reception at the county administration building.**

University of Missouri President Dr. Mun Choi visits with former state representative Mike Thomson during a meet and greet event August 3.

“I wanted to learn more about Northwest Missouri. I knew there was a terrific university here and I wanted to come explore options for partnerships,” Choi stated.

Choi toured the NW campus and met with officials to discuss future partnerships between the schools. Currently, the schools partner to provide students easier access to earning a doctorate of education, allowing students to take classes at either school that count toward the degree. Choi stated he would like to see the partnerships increase to include programs in agriculture, biology, health and sciences, medical and nursing degrees.

He is also working to reduce the cost of higher education for students by reducing textbook costs. He stated the average student spends approximately \$1,200 a year in textbooks. He is advocating for open source textbooks, textbooks that may be uploaded to a website and shared.

Choi offers incentives to his faculty to encourage them to use textbooks found on openstax.edu as well as to publish the books they author on the web source. He hopes to open communications with Northwest to allow for the sharing of textbooks across campuses.

# T COLUMBIA DAILY TRIBUNE

## EDITORIAL: [Is compromise possible on Affirmative Action??](#)

### NO MU MENTION

---

Over affirmative action policies, college and university admissions officers are stretched with one foot on the dock and the other on a vaguely tethered boat.

It's an understandable enigma. Earlier in history, students were admitted more capriciously based on criteria clearly linked to institutional welfare. The ability of the student to pay and to succeed academically headed the list. More recently admissions officers include race in an effort to increase diversity on campus.

A number of campuses developed “affirmative action” policies overtly aimed at favoring minorities, leading to complaints from student applicants who were better qualified otherwise but passed over because they did not meet ethnic criteria. Courts came down on both sides, finding some affirmative action policies justified and some having gone too far.

Now, with the arrival of the Trump Justice Department, the acting head of the civil rights division says the department will tilt back toward a more conservative attitude.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that schools can seek the benefits of a diverse student body by using race as one factor among many in a “holistic” evaluation, but can’t establish explicit race-based quotas, obviously leaving a lot of wiggle — or fighting — room. The civil rights division promises to look harder for evidence admissions offices are putting too much emphasis on race. Even if you are a determined champion of diversity on campus you can’t get around obvious problems with affirmative action. On its face it is based on overt discrimination, but justified as discrimination with a purpose. This sort of allowance for subjectivity always asks for trouble. Affirmative action has odd consequences. Traditionally high achieving Asian applicants complain of unfair rejection lest they become over-represented. Based on strict academic and other empirical criteria, Asians may be admitted in numbers clearly disproportionate to their representation among applicants and, if rejected, soon enough may join others complaining of affirmative action.

Obviously, there is no empirical formula that can solve this riddle. Using strict academic criteria is sure to discriminate on ethnic grounds. Using strict ethnic criteria is sure to discriminate against some of superior academic potential.

Proper anti-discrimination policy prohibits forced segregation, but can it successfully promote integration? Affirmative action is an attempt to positively engineer diversity, a laudable goal but fraught with difficulty. The newly installed Justice Department will find some wiggle room here.  
*HJW III*

# The Washington Post

## How we communicate is changing. So should the way we think about free speech.

By SUZANNA NOSSEL

As college students wrap up summer jobs and internships, university administrations are girding for another round of campus battles over issues of free speech, protest, and the university’s role as a setting for education and intellectual exploration. For those a step removed from today’s college students (alumni, donors, parents and pundits), these periodic flare-ups have often been taken as dismaying evidence of a generation’s intolerance toward opposing views and free speech. Students who seek to shut down speech that offends — through calls to disinvite speakers, punish offensive remarks or shout down opponents — have been dismissed as coddled, unenlightened, entitled, anti-intellectual, dogmatic and infantile.

The desire to defend free speech and broad-mindedness is admirable, but a culture of respect for open discourse and tolerance for disagreeable opinions won't be built through insults, hand-wringing, financial pressure from irate alums or even the legal mandates now being proposed in some state legislatures. Those who are genuinely concerned about defending academic freedom and fostering intellectual diversity on campus would do well to grasp five factors that are fueling the impulse some students and professors have to try to silence speech they consider harmful.

The first factor at work is a striking lack of understanding of the basic premises that underpin free speech. Many student leaders of the recent campus protests evince only a cursory grasp of the principles enshrined in the First Amendment, much less the more complex and harder-to-articulate values of free inquiry and expression in which most American colleges and universities take pride. Whether the blame lies with the demise of university core curricula that typically included liberal philosophers such as John Milton and John Stuart Mill, the retreat from civics education in recent decades, or other factors, principles surrounding free expression, freedom of association and press freedom are poorly understood among millennials. According to a 2015 survey by the Newseum Institute, 33 percent of Americans have no idea what rights the First Amendment protects. Subsequent surveys revealed that 69 percent of students think universities should be able to restrict offensive speech or slurs, and that young people are more likely than their elders to believe that constitutional rights to religious freedom do not apply to faiths that are considered extreme or fringe.

What's more, some students, particularly nonwhite students, report that their primary experience with such strictures has occurred when "free speech" has been asserted as a justification or excuse for racist comments. **One prominent student leader from the University of Missouri, when told that punishing speech could violate the First Amendment, replied that "the First Amendment wasn't written for me."** Her meaning was twofold: that when the Bill of Rights was written, each black American was treated as three-fifths of a person, and that her own prime exposure to the precept was its invocation to protect white students and administrators from reprisals for speech she considered offensive. It doesn't help that, often, the only vocal advocates for free speech on campus lean toward the right. Left-leaning students may find that the clubs they belong to, professors they admire, or personalities they follow on social media are not interested in defending the right to voice unpopular views.

A second influence shaping the campus climate for speech is grounded in technological change. The old adage "Sticks and stones may break my bones but words can never hurt me" sounds quaint when insults, exposés, and quotes or video clips taken out of context can go viral online, leading swarms of antagonists to harass and intimidate a speaker with whom they disagree. The Internet offers a largely anonymous arena where hateful speech can easily flourish and where smears are available in perpetuity for family members or potential employers to stumble upon. The potency of social media has fueled calls to curtail and even shut down services like the now-defunct anonymous messaging app Yik Yak that seem to fuel cyberbullying. The potential for abusive online speech has made it difficult to argue that speech cannot do real damage and, correspondingly, that protections against harmful speech are unwarranted.

A third cause relates to the current movement for social equality in the United States. Our society has reformed many of the most obvious legal and structural manifestations of racism, sexism and anti-gay bias: keeping blacks from voting, firing women for getting pregnant, criminalizing gay sex and so forth. Now, the imperative to tackle more subtle and insidious forms of discrimination or exclusion — including the quietly denigrating terms and unconscious stereotypes that may reveal and entrench implicit bias — has rightly grown. Language is unavoidably implicated in this next phase of transformation. In fact, the evolution of language to reflect changing understandings of race, gender and culture is nothing new and does not simply indicate political correctness run amok. The terms “Negro,” “colored” and “Oriental” are all reminders that changing mores routinely render certain words out of bounds. As unfamiliar as some may find gender-neutral pronouns or neologisms such as Latinx, the insistence on them fits into this tradition, and the justifications behind them deserve a respectful hearing.

A fourth factor relates to our polarized and contentious political environment. The tone of political discourse had been degenerating well before Donald Trump arrived on the scene, but his campaign and election — achieved through his distinctively impudent style — have helped to normalize public speech that is intemperate, personally insulting, and derogatory toward women, the disabled, Muslims, African Americans, Jews and many other vulnerable groups.

The United States has the most protective standard for hate speech in the world, yet unwritten codes of civility and pluralism have, at least for the past few decades, largely confined overtly bigoted sentiments to the margins of society. With these views now voiced among some of Trump’s supporters and with the president himself repudiating them reluctantly, if at all, members of targeted minority groups understandably feel under siege, lacking confidence that their government will protect them. Students, meanwhile, see their campuses as places of refuge: a home where they can learn and socialize in security and relative comfort. If students witness a permissive environment for hateful speech in American society writ large, they will be more insistent in their demand for safeguards that prevent such attitudes from invading their schools.

The final development is that not all free speech standard-bearers come in peace. Conservative commentators including Milo Yiannopoulos, Ann Coulter and Richard Spencer style themselves as defenders of free speech for the purpose of building their brands and galvanizing followers, subscribers and book-buyers, but they manufacture confrontations to provoke controversy and draw headlines, rather than to elucidate ideas. This doesn’t mean they should be barred from campuses or silenced; they still have their rights. But those who rally in defense of their freedom to speak, and those who invite them to speak, should engage not only the question of their rights but also the substance of their message. Free speech cannot be turned into a partisan cause of the right: At its core, free expression is a progressive concept and a liberal value. We value the right of all to speak because we want equal rights for all.

A robust defense of free speech on campus should be an enlightened defense, one that is alert to the concerns and arguments roiling universities now. A first step for those who rightly fear for the future of free speech should be dialogue with students — historically the most impassioned defenders of campus free speech. To mobilize a new generation in that tradition will require listening to and understanding how it sees questions of race, gender and what it takes for a school to be a suitable setting for learning. Such conversations and engagement efforts are not an

alternative to a staunch intellectual, political and legal defense of free speech principles. They are a necessary enabler of it.