The initial Health Care Facilitator (HCF) program was launched by the UC Office of the President Human Resources in September 1999 as a pilot project at two campuses (UC Berkeley and UC Irvine). The project was the culmination of years of advocacy by emeriti and retiree organizations (CUCEA, CUCRA, UCB Retirement Center, and the Academic Senate) for a plan to help retired UC faculty and staff understand and benefit from their UC medical plans. By extending the plan to include all eligible UC personnel (active and retired), the Office of the President (OP) agreed to support a 2-year pilot project. Careful monitoring of the project throughout the trial period followed by a comprehensive evaluation report in 2001 showed it to be an unqualified success. A second 2-year pilot was approved but soon became a permanent program that was expanded by early 2003 to all nine campuses, the three national laboratories and the Office of the President. In 2005, UC Merced was added to the program.

An earlier CUCEA newsletter (April 2011) described these early beginnings. Why then do we need another article? Several reasons come to mind. It is now almost 15 years since the program was launched, but another analysis of the program comparable to the original 2001 report has not been produced. Change has been continuous. Member costs are rising as health care costs continue to increase and as UC’s contribution to retiree health plan premiums continues to drop towards a floor of 70%. The recent budget crisis has had its consequences, including a narrowly averted threat to the program’s continued existence. The multiple changes in UC health plans for 2014 made for a tumultuous 2013 open enrollment period that continues to rattle. Finally, the Affordable Care Act, or ACA, is now a reality. How has all this impacted the HCF program, those who run it and the members who benefit from it? To understand the current situation, who better to ask than the Health Care Facilitators who run the program. They have the experience and the expertise on which the program depends. This article is based on their responses. The primary focus is on the HCFs’ role in meeting the program’s objectives, but also includes some insight into the challenges they face in delivering their valuable service. As the author-editor of this article, I am indebted to their generosity in sharing with me their perspectives on the program – their role in its operation and its efficacy. I am fully responsible for any errors, misrepresentations, and the editorial opinions expressed herein (M.C.Caserio).

The Role of the Health Care Facilitator

The UCnet website states that the facilitator's role is “…to help faculty, staff, retirees [the members] to better understand and obtain the full benefits and services available from their UC-sponsored health plans, and to provide confidential one-on-one assistance in resolving health plan issues” (http://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/forms/pdf...
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hir-brochure.pdf). This is a correct but understated description that needs amplification to understand the core objectives of the program, its limitations and the scope of the facilitator’s role. The program is an integration of outreach, education, and assistance to members regarding their UC sponsored health insurance plans. It is mostly funded by UCOP but is run locally by the campus facilitators who report to the benefits function of the campus human resources department. Coordination of the locally managed programs is facilitated by UCOP.

To some extent, the structure of the program is campus dependent. Campuses have different populations to serve. There are regional differences in health care providers, and campuses with medical centers have a medical environment different from other campuses.

Education is at the heart of the program. It is the primary service and the most time-consuming, reflecting the need to help members understand the benefits covered (or not covered) in their health plan, and how to extract information from it. Communicating with members is accomplished both individually and collectively. Each campus has its own HCF website designed, maintained and updated locally, usually by the facilitator. The websites supplement the information available through UCnet, especially on local issues. In addition, facilitators arrange and produce workshops, group sessions, live and recorded presentations, and “help desks” on health insurance plans. These are offered periodically throughout the year, but are particularly frequent around annual open enrollment periods. Education becomes especially important when changes occur, such as during the recent open enrollment introducing the 2014 health plans that was notably more demanding - as will be discussed later.

Group communication is important and effective, but health care is a personal matter and the facilitators devote most of their time, on a daily basis, to communicating one-on-one with individual members. This is done mostly by phone and e-mail, but facilitators may meet personally with individual members by appointment if needed. However, the practice of in-person meetings varies by campus because the workload may make it impractical if not impossible to do so. A ten-minute phone inquiry can take an hour face-to-face, which is hard to justify when the call-back list is so long.

Although the skills of the HCFs are of greatest value on complex cases or escalating issues, many inquiries are straightforward requests for information. The HCFs encourage members to contact their primary information sources (insurers and medical providers) before contacting their local HCF. They encourage members to assume more responsibility to educate themselves and learn how to mine their health plans for the information they need. But, the facilitators also realize that calling an insurance administrator for information can be very frustrating. However much clients are reminded that the facilitator should not be their first point of contact, the level of frustration with insurance bureaucracy often drives them to do just that.

It is important for members to familiarize themselves with the basic language and terminology used in the health care industry. This could save facilitators time explaining the difference between a health plan and a provider, coinsurance and copay, a PPO and an HMO, or an Independent Practice Association (IPA) versus a clinically integrated medical group.

Members may be unaware of ongoing changes in health insurance models. While the fee-for-service model (whereby the individual is responsible for choosing the physician and the service) remains a central feature of insurance plans in the US, the dominant plan at UC is the HMO model (whereby the individual chooses a primary care physician who is responsible for managing and coordinating the member’s healthcare services). However, enrollment trends are in flux as health plans seek to control costs, add prevention/wellness programs, and comply with the Affordable Care Act (ACA). The newest model – encouraged by the ACA – is the Accountable Care Organization (ACO), which is a group of doctors, hospitals, and other health care providers who come together voluntarily to give coordinated, high quality care to their patients. In this changing environment, individuals need to understand the choices/options inherent in the different plans and how they interface with their
individual needs. This is where the HCF provides a necessary and valuable service to employees and retirees.

**Assistance.** As mentioned, the facilitator assists best by showing the members how they can solve a problem themselves rather than having the facilitator solve it for them. The HCF counsel is designed to help individuals help themselves since many issues can be resolved by the member with guidance and education from the HCF. However, the HCF is likely to intervene more directly when the member cannot resolve a problem unaided. For example, if a plan has denied a member’s claim or medical request, the HCF will provide guidance to the member regarding the plan’s coverage as well as the appeals process and the steps they can take to support their appeal — but the HCF will not actually write a letter of appeal for the member. Also, intervention is not possible if the plan is not a UC-sponsored plan. Billing problems are common, and the facilitator’s knowledge of the financial arrangements used by each health plan can help members understand whether a problem is best addressed by the plan administrator or by the provider’s billing office. These few illustrations only scratch the surface of the never-ending number of different problems requiring HCF assistance. Facilitators have the experience and knowledge of UC health insurance plans; they understand the problems members face; and they know how to access the right contacts in a given plan or provider network to best address the problem at hand.

The UCnet website also outlines what the HCF cannot do for members. The program deals only with health plan issues and does not help members with other benefits (e.g. retirement planning and finances).

**Data Collection.** Members have the primary claim to the facilitator’s time, but the HCF program goals also include an obligation to collect activity data from each location. The HCFs are responsible for recording and reporting the activity data to UCOP. The data is largely statistical and a valuable picture of each campus location that can be aggregated systemwide. The information has potential value to improve the UC benefits offerings, add to compliance efforts, and provide direction for education efforts. Currently, the use of the data to help achieve these objectives has not been fully realized, although the matter is under discussion.

**Retirees.** We asked the facilitators whether retirees contributed disproportionately to their workload. The answer is both “yes” and “no.” On the “no” side, on average, only about 40% of calls received are from retirees. On the “yes” side, retirees are fewer in number but make more calls because they have more health-related issues. Campuses make every effort to inform retirees about the service the program provides – and retirees make good use of it. Their needs are diverse. Some callers need help understanding UC’s policies regarding enrolling in Medicare, and understanding how Medicare works with their UC health plans. Some retirees misunderstand the limits of HCF assistance, expecting help with issues beyond the HCF’s domain (e.g. retirement planning, financial advice, medical advice, completing forms, and calls to Medicare and Social Security). Facilitators will refer the callers to the more appropriate resource such as the local benefits office and UC’s Retirement Administration Service Center (RASC). But most callers have legitimate requests. As a group, they may call more frequently about authorization requests, denials, and urgent access needs. Also, the facilitators recognize that some are too ill or disabled to assist in the management of their own health needs and, on occasion, the facilitator will work with family members, who can intervene directly on their behalf. Facilitators are also aware that retirees have a more difficult time adjusting to member services that are increasingly marketed through the web and complicated phone menus. Because of their discomfort with new technologies, retirees are more likely to call the HCF for direct help. No doubt this will change, but the sympathetic guidance and counseling they currently receive from facilitators is well placed and appreciated. Remember also that the HCF program is the one benefit resource on campus available to both employees and retirees. There are other opportunities for retiree-specific counsel and education through local and systemwide retiree and emeriti organizations.
The 2014 Health Benefits Open Enrollment

The recent open enrollment period was a very challenging experience for everyone involved because of the unprecedented number for changes in UC-sponsored health plans for 2014. The HCF program was hard hit by the resulting elevated workload. The anxiety level was high as members faced the discontinuation of old plans, introduction of new plans, and other disruptions resulting from plan changes large and small. The facilitators’ call-volume escalated, as did demands on them to arrange numerous group sessions, presentations, town hall meetings and daily help-desks. Although pending changes were advertised well in advance, their reality nevertheless resulted in considerable confusion. Facilitators are routinely briefed on changes in health plans by OP, but the process was complicated this year because not all the administrative details concerning the plan contracts had been fully negotiated prior at the start of open enrollment. Consequently, information arrived late, piecemeal, sometimes contradicting earlier messages. Faced with an anxious clientele, and an incomplete deck of cards, it was difficult for UCOP and the HCF to launch a smooth open enrollment, and it was difficult for members to make decisions about their health plans without all the information.

The widely distributed brochure “Big Changes New Choices” was the main UCOP documentation on the 2014 plan changes. It justifies the revamped menu of plans as providing “better value and clearer choices.” Additionally, earlier articles in various University publications, including in each of the four 2013 New Dimensions (see http://ucnet.universityofcalifornia.edu/retirees/new-dimensions/) provided a deeper explanation of the anticipated changes. It is clear that the new UC Care plan was designed to promote use of UC medical providers (UC medical centers, doctors, hospitals, labs, and medical groups). Even so, the implications of the changes were a challenge to digest.

Facilitators were on the front lines during this period, responding to people's anxiety, confusion and unanticipated consequences of plan changes. Campus populations have been variously affected, particularly those non-Medicare members enrolled in the previous Anthem PLUS and Health Net HMO plans, both of which were eliminated. Additions to the UC Care Select provider network were made, resulting in some unforeseen problems for members at some campus locations. It is not appropriate to document the details in this article, and efforts are ongoing to resolve “unforeseen” problems, but the point is that the issues set in motion by the plan changes illustrate the challenging environment the HCFs faced throughout the tumultuous 2013 enrollment period. In spite of being forewarned about the coming changes, many of us paid them little attention, perhaps feeling that the plan we have had and been comfortable with for years could not possibly be affected. Persons on sabbatical or away from campus for whatever reason were often caught unaware that they had to make important plan decisions before open enrollment ended. Inaction or inattention is the reason facilitators encourage all members to be more aware of their health plan options and to keep track of changing costs and coverage even during periods when they don't need the benefits.

A controversial change was UC’s decision to change the health benefits structure for retirees in Medicare who reside outside California. UC now offers them a health reimbursement account that they can use to pay their own supplemental Medicare plan premiums, as well as Medicare Part B premiums and copays. A “Medicare coordinator” company One Exchange (previously named Extend Health) manages the reimbursement process and counsels retirees on their individual plan options. This change, while apparently increasingly common for retirees of many large organizations, was understandably upsetting for those involved. Inevitably, the facilitators fronted ensuing concerned calls from affected retirees. To be clear, Medicare retirees outside of California enrolled with One Exchange may still use the HCF program for issues related to other UC health benefits such as dental and vision, but assistance regarding their health reimbursement account and Medicare plan is now offered through One Exchange.

Additionally, open enrollment coincided with the national rollout of the Affordable Care Act (ACA).
The ACA had little impact on UC's plan decisions for 2014 since UC medical plans are already compliant with federal regulations imposed by the ACA, including the inclusion of no-cost preventive care, no pre-existing condition limitations, and the extension of dependent benefits to children up to age 26. Even so, the initially flawed nationwide launch of the ACA added to existing anxiety levels and fueled many of the member calls to the HCFs. Burgeoning ACA rules and regulations will certainly have long term consequences for UC medical plans and make the service the HCFs offer a continuing necessity.

The Benefits Office and the HCF.

Early in the conceptual development of the program, doubt surfaced on the wisdom of placing the HCF within the management structure of the campus benefits office. The concern was that the program could lose its identity and be absorbed into the general functioning of the benefits office. In truth, with few exceptions, the program has become an integral component of most campus benefits offices. Retention of the HCF program's unique identity is critically important, but understaffing and underfunding have seriously impacted both campus benefits and the HCF program. Staff collaboration and overlap of function has been unavoidable for some campuses, but this has not lessened the importance of retaining the campus program's identity.

Budgetary Issues and Editor's Comments

Increasing demand on every campus for HCF services is responsible for the high daily workload. It is a testimony to the program's success but also to the need to alleviate the load shouldered by the facilitators. On some campuses, the program is staffed by only one person. Other campsuses with more resources support an assistant for the facilitator, while others draw on the benefits office staff to help out. Overall, however, it is the Author's opinion that the program at every campus is understaffed.

The central OP budget for the program has not changed since it began in 1999. It provides support for only one facilitator at each location, regardless of the size of the population served or variations in campus resources. The recent dramatic reduction in state support for the University and the ensuing UC budget crisis forced UCOP to rethink its support models for UC benefit programs. The HCF budget was targeted for redirection to local campuses for support, and many believed this placed the program in peril of closure. As it is, varying levels of supplementary campus funding have been crucial in sustaining local programs, but few campuses could support the program without UCOP support. However, the architects of the program, its many clients, and especially the chair of the Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (Robert May) argued persuasively and successfully for UCOP's continued support.

While this is good news, I believe it signals UCOP to consider rethinking its budget model and design a more efficient management plan. There is abundant evidence to justify continuation of the program. Health insurance plans are becoming more complex and difficult to comprehend without expert help. So, this suggests that it would be cost effective for UC to have a well-staffed HCF program of experts to assist employees and retirees negotiate the health care maze. It would benefit all parties, including the insurers.

It would also be advantageous for UCOP to continue to involve the facilitators in the health program's operational decisions. It is well understood that the facilitators do not manage or make decisions about the health plans, but they are responsible for interpreting them for the employees and retirees. They thereby gain experience in how the plans work for individuals and what unforeseen outcomes arise. They are witness to the changing healthcare environment and general trends in healthcare, including consumer access issues, and opportunities for consumer education. They are familiar with healthcare issues of special importance at their campus location, and recognize the importance of maintaining the local integrity of the HCF program. Their expertise and the advice that can spring from it can be of real value, especially at times when significant plan changes are being considered. Workload demands have no doubt hindered the HCFs from more assertively promoting the value of their on-the-job experience, but this should not prevent UCOP from recognizing and harnessing it. Without question, the HCF's primary responsibility is to individuals, assisting them with their health plan needs, but they also
have a broader, valuable role as agents that link the health plan manager with the needs of the health plan consumer. Their service to all of us is deeply appreciated.

Acknowledgement. I wish to thank the Health Care Facilitators at each of the ten UC campuses and the Office of the President Human Resources for their valuable commentary on the HCF program that made this article possible. They are: Sharon Johnson (Berkeley), Loida Bartolome-Mingao (LBNL), Guerren Solbach (Davis), Glenn Rodriguez (Irvine), Bridget Sheehan-Watanabe (Los Angeles), Leticia Aldama (Merced), Mary Johnson (Riverside), Laura Morgan (Santa Barbara), Frank Trueba (Santa Cruz), Debra Wells (San Diego), and Susan Forstat (San Francisco). Thank you all.

Marjorie C. Caserio, Author and Newsletter Editor

Letter From The Chair
W. Douglas Morgan, UCSB

SIXTY ONE THOUSAND

Yes, the total number of University of California retirees is 61 thousand. The information is reliable (source is UC’s RASC), and amounts to the number of persons in benefits payment status. This is a very large number—equal to the population of three medium size UC campuses or two large ones. Yet—not all UC campuses have a dedicated retiree/emeriti center, and this is the point we wish to stress.

Two meetings ago, Sue Barnes from the UC Davis Retiree Center provided those of us without a Center with information on the Davis Center and some of the procedures that they used at Davis to establish the Center. It is now time for the rest of us to act. It is imperative that retirees and emeriti all work together to establish Centers at every campus.

Some of the many topics of concern for Campus Emeriti Associations and Centers will be discussed at the joint CUCEA/CUCRA meeting at UCSB, May 1. They include:

- Moving from employment to retirement. Are we providing the necessary foundations?
- Health Care - Retirees on Medicare not in California. Discussion with OP and JBC.
- Health Care Facilitators (see excellent article in this newsletter).

All this and more in Santa Barbara. WDM

The Coursera Experience

William Ashby, UCSB

There is currently much animated discussion in the UC community about the appropriate role of online education. I am in no way an expert in educational delivery, online or traditional. But I do know something about the online learning experience from the student perspective, having taken four MOOCs (massive open online courses).

Six years into retirement, I discovered Coursera (www.coursera.org), thanks to an article that appeared about this new venture in a 2012 issue of the University of Michigan alumni magazine. Michigan was one of the founding partners of Coursera, along with Stanford and the University of Pennsylvania. To date, I have completed three MOOCs ("with distinction," no less): Listening to World Music, taught by Professor Carol Muller of the University of Pennsylvania, Greek and Roman Mythology, taught by Professor Peter Struck also of Penn, and Citizenship and U.S. Immigration, taught by Professor Polly Price of Emory University. I am currently enrolled in Roman Architecture, taught by Professor Diana Kleiner of Yale University.

What is a MOOC? It is indeed massive, often with 30,000 or 40,000 students enrolled from around the globe. It is open (and free of cost), without application procedures or formal prerequisites. It is also open in the sense that one can participate to whatever degree one wishes and can drop the course at any time. (If one wishes a certificate of completion, however, all requirements must be satisfied.) It is entirely online (although there are "meetups" in some communities, where one can have face-to-face encounters with fellow Courserans). Courses extend for a few weeks to a full semester. I spend an average of eight to ten hours per week on each course. As I write,
Coursera offers 602 courses across the disciplines, and there are 98 participating institutions (including UC Irvine). A similar MOOC platform is EdX, in which UC Berkeley is a participant; but I have no direct experience with it.

Like traditional undergraduate humanities or social science courses with which I am familiar, the courses I have taken entail lectures by the professor, discussion sessions, required and/or recommended readings (and/or use of audio/visual materials), written papers and examinations. The lectures are delivered in short video segments, each between 10 and 20 minutes. Discussion sessions entail participation (active or passive) in thematically grouped online discussion forums, moderated by the TA’s and the professor. Obviously, the professor cannot read and evaluate thousands of written papers and essays. Instead, the papers are subject to peer review. Students wishing to earn a certificate of completion must not only submit their own written work, but also must also read and evaluate four or five essays written by fellow students. Exams and quizzes are of the multiple choice or true/false variety, which can easily be computer scored.

For the most part, the lectures I have followed have been top notch. They are conceived and delivered by ladder faculty at esteemed institutions. The three courses I have so far completed have been online versions of the professor’s regular undergraduate courses, specially adapted (and, it must be said, somewhat watered down) for Coursera. The Coursera platform actually offers some advantages over traditional lecture room delivery. Students can pause or rewind the lecture whenever they wish (for example, to look up the meaning of a term used by the professor, to check a reference, reread a passage, etc.) The professor can also push the pause button midstream and invite the students to consult online resources before continuing (e.g., a map, an image, an audio or video file).

The discussion forums are very active, but of varying quality. Some fellow students go out of their way to add to the course, offering suggestions of additional reading, pointing to additional online resources, and relating personal insights and experiences. There is some attempt by the staff to moderate the discussion, but occasionally the discussion drifts far away from the subject matter at hand.

The peer review of written work is also a mixed bag. Many of the participants are obviously not native speakers of English, and I have found it difficult to determine to what degree style and usage should come into play in the evaluation of their written work. Some of the comments I received on my own written work were interesting and insightful, while others were incomprehensible or petty. Of course, I would have preferred to have the professor’s evaluation of my work, rather than that of anonymous peers. The quizzes and exams have been straightforward and fair, but, as I said, they are necessarily limited to multiple choice or true/false format.

Who are the students enrolled in the MOOCs? Based on information offered in the discussion forums I have followed, it seems that they come in all ages and from all corners of the globe—India, China, Russia, Eastern Europe, South America are well represented. I have read that a high percentage of students taking MOOCs already have a university education (and consequently already know how to learn on their own).

What do the MOOCs suggest about the role of online delivery in the university curriculum? Clearly, they are no substitute for the traditional classroom, where the professor can engage the students in face-to-face discussion, moderate discussion among students, help students who do not understand the material, etc. In my opinion, online learning does have a place in higher education, but as a complement, not a replacement of the traditional classroom. Some institutions are already incorporating MOOCs as components of, but not as replacements for, traditional courses. This seems entirely appropriate and interesting, especially at institutions that do not have cutting-edge research faculty and broad disciplinary coverage. As for us emeriti, I can highly recommend the MOOCs as a way to explore new intellectual vistas.

William Ashby is Professor Emeritus of French, and Linguistics, University of California, Santa Barbara. He served as Provost of Creative Studies at UCSB for twelve years prior to retirement. He is currently Secretary to CUCEA.
Update on UC’s Online Education

Two informative reports on online education at UC and elsewhere were prepared for the UC Regents’ Committee on Education Policy at their January 2013 and 2014 meetings (see http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/jan13/e2.pdf, and http://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/jan14/e3.pdf).

The reports confirm that the University is making a serious effort to develop web-based instruction for UC students across the university system. The main focus is on creating faculty-generated web-based courses that carry credit in undergraduate degree programs for enrolled students. To take full advantage of the online environment, a student should be able to enroll and receive credit for an online course regardless of which campus the course emanates from. This is not as simple as it sounds because course approvals do not readily transfer beyond the host campus. Nonetheless, cross-campus enrollments are already happening. It is just that the process is imperfect and needs to be more automatic and easier for the student to receive credit for GE, major and minor courses. The online courses are also available to non-UC students for a fee, but to date this source of revenue has fallen short of expectations. Apparently, the current UC online courses mostly target enrolled UC students and UC extension students.

Nationally, there are ongoing efforts to extend credit-bearing courses across university systems, and some institutions offer whole degree programs online to external students. As a separate online education venture, several major universities, including some UC campuses, participate in Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs). The accompanying article, “The Coursera Experience”, by William Ashby in the newsletter describes these courses from a student’s perspective. As he points out, MOOCs enroll massive numbers of students, are entirely free of charge, and do not earn course credit or meet any educational requirement. However, there are hints that UC is looking more closely at MOOCs as a potential educational tool in the instructional curriculum. However, there are also hints to the contrary (see reference to President Napolitano’s comments below). UC’s systemwide entry into the online field began under President Udof’s leadership. A pilot project to encourage faculty to develop undergraduate web-based instruction began in 2012 with the UC Online Education (UCOE) program. This program has now been supplemented by the UC Innovative Learning Technology Initiative, which has similar objectives. The ILTI initiative appears to be a collaboration of sorts between the Provost’s Office at OP and the Academic Senate. The initiative receives state funds and has currently approved development of 30 undergraduate courses from all nine general campuses. The courses chosen for development are perceived as “high-need” to meet general education and major degree requirements. Apparently, 21 of these courses were thought to be available before the end of the 2014 academic year, although the fully automatic cross-campus enrollment process is unlikely to be in place until 2015. The University’s progress is slow, and the course offerings are minimal. The crossenroll website http://crossenroll.universityofcalifornia.edu lists 11 courses from four campuses for the Winter 2014, and 12 courses from six campuses for the Spring 2014.

Progress is being made, but not fast enough for some, including California’s Governor Brown. His comments at the January 2014 Regents meeting left no doubt as to his views. Looking beyond our solar system, he said, “If this university can probe into “black holes”, can’t somebody create a course — Spanish, calculus, whatever — totally online?” (Sacramento Bee, January 23, 2014). Surprisingly, perhaps, UC President Napolitano is apparently unconvinced that online education is the panacea for higher education’s ills. Rather, she describes it as a “tool for the toolbox”, not a “silver bullet.” See the video “A Conversation with UC President Janet Napolitano” https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KZPfSS8wVwg. Her remarks mirror those of many faculty who are supportive of thoughtful innovation but feel that online courses work better with upper division and postgraduate students who are more mature and self-motivated learners. This is suggestive of lessening support for high-enrollment core courses offered in an online format. So, it is not yet clear which way the wind is blowing, but one can make a general statement that UC’s online goals are to provide high-quality courses that are available across all UC campuses as a routine and cost-effective part of a UC education.
EMERITI AWARDS 2013-2014

UC BERKELEY. The French Legion of Honor has been awarded to Professor George Leitmann. This is France’s highest decoration that can be given for civil or military conduct in service to the French Republic. Created in 1802 by Napoleon Bonaparte, the award was established to recognize extraordinary contributions to France, regardless of birth or class, focusing solely on merit. Though the honor is French, citizens of other nations who risked their lives on French soil fighting in World War II may be given the distinction. Only a small number of Legion of Honor medals are awarded each year to U.S. veterans, and great care is taken to select only those with the most distinguished records. Professor George Leitmann’s military record more than lives up to the necessary criteria. On the World War II battlefield and during the period of reconstruction that followed, Professor Leitmann served the French Republic in ways that exemplify the conduct required to be appointed to the rank of Knight of the Legion of Honor. Since then, and into retirement, he has built a distinguished record of achievement at UCB, Department of Mechanical Engineering, in the field of control theory.

Every year the UCB Emeriti Association honors a retiree with the title of Emeritus of the Year. For 2013-2014, the honor went to Professor Emeritus John Prausnitz, Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering in recognition of his achievements since retirement.

UC DAVIS. The UCD Emeriti Association has an annual award called Distinguished Professor Emeritus (or Emerita). This year, the Emeriti Association chose Professor Emeritus Thomas Cahill of the Land, Air, and Water Resources Department to receive the 2014 UC Davis Distinguished Emeritus Award. Professor Emeritus Cahill has had an outstanding professional career in the area of atmospheric aerosols. Since retiring, he has continued to conduct research and has contributed greatly to our understanding of the impact of atmospheric contamination, including analyses of particulates created by the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center. Professor Emeritus Cahill has performed significant service internationally and locally since his retirement and continues to contribute to the knowledge base in his area of expertise.

UC Davis also honored four campus emeriti with Dickson Emeriti Fellowship Awards. They are: William Jackson, Chemistry, for “The Study of VUV Photochemistry on N2 and CO using Seeded Molecular Beams in He.” William Lasley, Population and Reproduction, School of Medicine, for “Determining the Role of Circulating Progesterone to Increase Negative Mood.” James Murphy, English, Rhetoric and Communication, for “To Complete a Book Now in Progress, Titled The Gentlemen’s Rhetoric of Obadiah Walker, in 1616-1699.” Cal Quaiset, Plant Sciences, for “Diversity Analyses of Landrace Populations of Wheat from Turkey and Iran, and Maize from Mexico”

UC IRVINE. Political science professor emeritus Rein Taagepera received the 2013 UCI Outstanding Emeritus Award in recognition of his exceptional post-retirement contributions in research, teaching and service.

Two Dickson Emeriti Fellowship Awards were made in 2013. The recipients were English-professor J. Hillis Miller and History-professor Keith L. Nelson. Miller was the 2011 Panunzio awardee, and is a well-known deconstructionist critic. Nelson is one of the founding faculty of UCI. He is a specialist in European-American relations and the role of ideology in theory.

UC SANTA BARBARA. Three Dickson Emeriti Professorships have been awarded since 2012. The recipients are: Eduardo Orias, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor, Department of Ecology, Evolution, and Marine Biology. Alice Condodina, Professor Emerita, Department of Theater and Dance. Steven Fisher, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor, Department of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology.
Professor Emeritus Michael Thaler is an educator, scientist, physician, and historian. He has published extensively in the bioscientific and medical literature, and holds several prestigious scientific and public service awards including a 2014 Edward Dickson Faculty Fellowship. This was in recognition of his research in a project entitled "Premature Cancer Research at UCSF: Rise and Fall of the Laboratory of Experimental Oncology, 1947-53". Professor Thaler is also the 2013-2014 President of the UCSF Emeriti Association.

LOCATION, LOCATION, LOCATION
Siting Tales of UC Campuses

If you attended the recent November 2013 meeting of the Councils of Emeriti and Retiree Associations in San Francisco, you will know that we were privileged to visit the “new” UCSF Mission Bay Campus and Medical Center. The entire complex is truly impressive, especially when reminded that only fourteen years ago the site was an abandoned railway yard. At the time, UCSF was in desperate need to accommodate its expanding research and teaching missions that long since had outgrown the Parnassus campus.

Limited open space and concerns over building research facilities close to residential neighborhoods made for big problems in locating new campus sites within the city. When it seemed that the only option was to build outside of the city, a solution was found in a run down area of San Francisco Bay south of the Oakland Bay Bridge. The redevelopment that ensued is a modern miracle that has benefited all parties involved (the biotech industry, the community, the city economy, the University medical care, teaching and research).

It is not uncommon for UC to have growing pains when planning for new and expanding campuses.

Some of the missteps and frustrations get lost with the passing of time, and official reports are usually attenuated to downplay sore spots. But it is interesting to recall some of the siting problems that befell the younger UC campuses, Santa Cruz, Irvine, San Diego, and Merced.

Ultimately, authority to approve funding for a new UC campus rests with the State; but the Regents authorize the planning for it. The process begins with the appointment of a Site Selection Task Force that identifies possible sites and narrows them down according to a few guiding principles, including enrollment demand, need, proximity to population centers, physical and natural resources, and access. The Regents make the final selection, usually based on circumstances (donation of land, donation of funds, environmental factors, local and state politics). Broad consultation with faculty or campus administrations is seldom possible at this stage because there usually are none to consult.

Following the recommendations of the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education, the Regents authorized planning for three new general campuses. They chose areas of California experiencing growth but lacking a UC campus. A brief summary of the siting histories for each of these campuses follows.

UC Santa Cruz. Locating the site for the Santa Cruz campus was initially straightforward. The Regents chose Santa Cruz over the larger city of San Jose. No doubt they were enchanted by the beautiful coastal redwoods and meadows of the Cowell Family Ranch in the Santa Cruz hinterland, and the opportunity to select a parcel for the new campus. At the time, the City of Santa Cruz enthusiastically supported the location of the campus in their backyard. Paradoxically, the problems that ensued largely emanated from the city council’s opposition to the expansion plans for the campus and its surroundings. The serious challenges to campus plans to build out the campus community began in the 1960s when environmental issues, a liberal city council, and a counterculture of students and faculty, placed heavy restrictions on campus plans.
expansion, including local industrial and housing development. It was not until 2008 that an agreement was finally reached to drop lawsuits and allow expansion measures to move forward.

**UC Irvine.** Site selection plans for the Irvine campus took a slightly different path. The name of the campus is derived from that of James Irvine, the founder of The Irvine Ranch, on which the campus sits. There was no city of Irvine in 1960. In fact there was nothing but rabbits and cattle. The Irvine Company owned this vast ranch. The company donated a large parcel of open ranch land to the University and sold the University some adjoining acreage. Initially, however, this lonely parcel of Irvine ranch land was not the Regents preferred choice of site for the new campus. They favored a spectacular site overlooking the Pacific Ocean called Spy Glass Hill. However, in the 1960s there existed on this site a small cemetery that the owner was loath to relinquish. The Regents attempt to secure the site for the campus was thwarted when the cemetery owner apparently exhumed six bodies from another location and reburied them in the coastal cemetery, thereby making it problematic for the University to displace them from their resting place a second time. This may sound like a tall story but it was checked and confirmed by Harold Moore, a founding UC Irvine faculty member, who located the gravesite of four of the long-departed imposters. Their ocean view is out of this world.

Unlike Santa Cruz, the counterculture era of the 60s had little influence on Irvine’s development plans, but the outcome was much the same because the Orange County community was apathetic towards the campus and left it to its moonscape isolation during its formative years. The anticipated development of the local campus environment did not occur until the boom years of the 80s and 90s. Expansion in and around the campus is now phenomenal. It no longer is a moonscape, and the Irvine Company has become one of the wealthiest developers in the nation.

**UC San Diego** is yet another story. Roger Revelle, former Director of UC's Scripps Institute of Oceanography (SIO) is the acknowledged founder and visionary planner of the San Diego campus. He worked passionately and aggressively on behalf of the campus and its environment, favoring a site for the new campus on the Torrey Pines mesa in La Jolla above UC's SIO campus. He succeeded in convincing the San Diego city council to deed several parcels of pueblo land on the mesa to the University for the proposed campus. In turn, the neighboring WWII UC Marine Corp’s Camp Mathews would be ceded to the campus. Unfortunately, Revelle’s choice of the mesa site drew fierce opposition from Regent Edwin Pauley, a powerful Regent who contended that navy jets from nearby Miramar Naval Air Station would create an impossible noise level for a university campus. The animosity between Revelle and Pauley is legendary and was very obvious at the time. Each went to great lengths to make their points. Regent Pauley was known to publically oppose the building of any new campus, preferring to build out the existing sites at Berkeley and LA. Purportedly, he invited some of the Regents to his private island in Hawaii and exposed them to a thundering flyover from a nearby airfield. Revelle, however, won the day by exposing Regent Pauley’s deceptive efforts to invalidate the University’s estimate of noise reduction costs. The La Jolla site won the Regents approval with one nay vote, that of Regent Pauley. But it was a pyrrhic victory for Revelle. In the end, Pauley’s influence with the Regents prevailed and they did not appoint Revelle as the founding Chancellor of the campus for which he had worked so hard. Yet he remains in everyone’s heart and mind as founder of the UCSD campus.

**UC Merced.** Perhaps the most turbulent and prolonged siting saga was that of the Merced campus. The Regents authorized planning for one additional campus in 1988 with the understanding that it would be located in the San Joaquin Valley of Central California. It was argued that this valuable agricultural region of the State had much to gain educationally and economically by adding a UC campus. Serious budget problems in the early 90s delayed planning but in 1995 the Regents approved a site near Merced. This small city won out over the
larger city of Fresno, no doubt because of donation of a 2000 acre of undeveloped land within the Virginia Smith Trust property in the vicinity of Merced. Physical and academic planning continued in the ensuing years with a projected opening by 2004. The problem was that the University had unwittingly chosen the most environmentally sensitive site in the whole area. It was part of a huge area of seasonal wetlands that was home to some rare flora and fauna, especially five endangered species of fairy shrimp. Even with local and state approvals of the site development, the likelihood of winning federal approval was remote. The University was forced to move the construction to a site where jurisdiction over wetlands development was not an issue. They chose a golf course. It was closer to Merced but still within the Virginia Smith Trust property. This was truly a David and Goliath story. The one-inch-long, twenty two-legged wiggling fairy shrimp won a temporary victory over the biggest public university in the world. By 2003, faculty and graduate students began arriving. In lieu of a campus, several "campus learning centers" or satellite sites were established in Fresno, Bakersfield, Modesto, and Merced. Research facilities were made available at the Castle Air Force Base. Progress in planning long-range development was continuous while limited construction on the golf course acres proceeded, but when the campus officially opened in 2005 few facilities were actually built. The challenge is how to build the rest of the campus on nearby lands considered environmentally fragile, and how to mitigate its impact on the wetlands environment. The good news is that expansion plans to 2020 approved by the Regents in May 2013 were accepted in 2014 by the permitting agencies. The campus can finally plan for enrollments of 10,000 students by 2020 and provide its students with needed infrastructure, housing, facilities, access, industrial and academic facilities — and fairy shrimps.

A Fairy Shrimp, with 22 legs, swimming upside down.