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A Prescription for the Future Health of The University of California

By Charles E. Young

The Current Condition

I am very pleased to have this opportunity to convey some of my thoughts on the current condition of the University of California as well as prescriptions for its future success. Those of us who love and cherish our university are no doubt familiar with the financial woes that have beset it over the past two decades, and especially in the opening years of the 21st century. Throughout its history, budgetary support from the state for higher education has waxed and waned, but by the early 1990’s the budget curve began to move on a generally downward path, leading over time to the devastatingly low levels we see today. If more data on this point is needed, two excerpts from an item presented to the Regents’ Committee on Finance at its meeting on March 29 of this year (Item F9) tell that story very well:

- The state’s contribution to UC, on a per-student basis, has declined by 60 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars since 1990. As a result, for the first time in our history, the amount the University raises from tuition and fees exceeds the amount it receives from the state.

- UC today relies on the same absolute level of funding as in 1997-98, even though it educates 73,000 more students, operates one additional undergraduate campus, and offers scores of new programs and degrees.

The budgetary situation this year is, perhaps the worst in terms of state support. According to the report cited above, “For fiscal year 2011-12, the state cut funding for the University of California by $750 million – $650 million in the budget act, and $100 million in a mid-year cut – which represents a 25 percent reduction in our state allocation in one year.” Whether or not initiative measures on the ballot this fall, increasing taxes and reducing other state general revenue general expenditures, pass, further cuts in state funding are likely next year.
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Of course the University’s budget has not decreased to the full extent of the cuts in the state budget. The losses have been ameliorated by several means, including: increased overhead from contract and grant income; increased contributions to general funds from private gifts and grants, and ancillary services such as medical centers, parking, housing and related programs; more recently from increased admission of out-of-state students; and (most importantly) dramatic increases in tuition and fees. Students now bear roughly 49 percent of the cost of education, whereas 20 years ago their share was only about 13 percent. This year, the amount of funds received from state appropriations is less than that received from tuition.

Despite the fact that the university would be drastically crippled by cuts in state funding over the last three decades without the implemented tuition increases, those increases would be unacceptable if they had resulted in making UC less accessible, becoming, in fact, privatized in its mission as well as in its funding. Fortunately, that has not been the case. Rather than limiting access and providing for less diversity than before, the opposite has occurred. UC is, today, at least as accessible, and the make up of the students at least as representative of socio-economic classes as when tuition began its substantial ascent more than two decades ago.

These counter-intuitive findings regarding continued accessibility are the result of the fact that a high tuition/high financial aid policy is much better at providing access than the traditional low or no tuition practice which long prevailed in most public universities and was one of the principles of the California Master Plan for Higher Education approved by the California Legislature in 1960.

The fact that this high tuition/high aid policy has worked successfully for UC is primarily due to the fact that, along with tuition increases necessitated by reduced funding from the state, support for those students who need fellowships, grants and/or loans to be able to attend one or more UC campuses has increased at an even greater rate.

These funds have come from four major sources: the Federal government (primarily the Pell Grant); The State of California (the Cal Grant); privately funded scholarships and fellowships; and the program of “Return to Aid” which allocates at least 1/3 of the funds raised by tuition to enhance the available financial aid for students with need.

The following excerpt (from the March 29 report to the Regents’ Finance Committee cited above) is an excellent verification of the success of the high fee/high aid option being pursued by UC as a result of the unofficial state policy of privatization:

“About 40 percent of all UC undergraduates receive Pell Grants; the recipients come from families with an annual household income of $50,000 or less. Four UC campuses – Berkeley, Davis, UCLA and San Diego – each enroll more Pell Grant recipients than the entire Ivy League combined. In addition, UC’s Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan ensures that 100 percent of in-state tuition and fees is covered by scholarships or grants for California students eligible for financial aid who come from a family with an annual household income of $80,000 or less. These students pay no system-wide tuition or fees. UC also covered the 2011/2012-fee increase of $1,890 for needy families earning up to $120,000 per year. In fact, overall, the University estimates that the most recent tuition increase was covered for 55 percent of all UC students and that net tuition per student last year was only $4,400 – among the lowest of its comparator institutions.”

Prospects for the Future

It is fortunate that, along with careful control of expenditures, increased income from all of the sources set forth above, especially increasingly greater reliance on higher tuition, have enabled UC’s campuses to minimize the erosion in quality and ability to serve the needs of California expected from the increasing disinvestment by the state. However, all signs indicate that the recent history of disinvestment is likely to continue for the
foreseeable future even though the University of California is the state’s major engine of economic and social development.

The reasons for this prediction are many. The primary cause of California’s fiscal woes is the impact of Proposition 13, passed by the voters in 1978. That proposition rolled back local property taxes to an extent that many services, which had traditionally been supported by local governmental agencies, were no longer sustainable at the local level. As a result, the state, which at that time had a rare fund surplus, took on those functions. The primary beneficiary of that transfer was the public school system, which then became the major recipient of appropriations from the state general fund.

The second major effect of Proposition 13 was the requirement that legislation allocating funds or increasing taxes had to be passed by a 2/3 majority of both houses of the Legislature.

Ten years later, another initiative measure (Proposition 98) provided that a set amount of the State General Fund (45%) must be allocated to the public schools. This put an additional squeeze on the funds available to support other functions such as Higher Education.

That proposition also requires that any shortfall in funding public schools in a given year due to difficult economic conditions, such as those we have encountered for the past several years, create an obligation for make-up funding in the future. For that reason, the state now owes the public schools several billion dollars beyond the annual requirement of Proposition 98. This means that the bulk of any increased revenue from economic recovery or higher taxes will be directed toward meeting that obligation and, therefore, unavailable for funding UC or the State University system (CSU).

In short, the fiscal problems that prevent or make unlikely a return to support levels of the pre-1990’s era are not related to the current recession but to long-standing structural issues. All of these issues are exacerbated by the fact that most of these impediments to wise budget and policy-making are entrenched in California’s Constitution and cannot be removed except through the initiative process itself, making it unlikely that we will see a return to pre-1990’s funding for UC in the foreseeable future. If so, the status quo strategy of appealing to the Governor and Legislature for a return to the old levels of support, student marches on Sacramento, etc., needs to be abandoned and replaced by a new strategy.

A Strategy for the Future

I, and others, have written prescriptions for funding UC in the context of the funding possibilities just described. (See for example, my article, “Policy Options for University of California Budgeting” in California Policy Options 2011, UCLA School of Public Affairs.)

However, I believe one set of recommendations stands out as especially useful. In June of 2011, a group of ex-chancellor’s of UC campuses, co-chaired by former President Atkinson and myself, met in San Francisco to discuss the funding problems facing UC. The meeting lasted 2 days, was attended by 22 of the 29 living ex-chancellors and included at least one former CEO from each campus. After much discussion, they met with President Yudof and reviewed their conclusions with him. Following adjournment of the meeting their views were summarized in a letter sent to Yudof on August 4, 2011. In that letter, the former chancellors generally lauded the President and Regents on their approach to date, including the largely non-controversial tactics of:

- **Cutting expenditures in any reasonable way which would not negatively affect the ability of UC to admit all qualified California residents who sought entry**

- **Increasing income from all of the traditional sources which were mentioned in detail above**
• **Raising tuition to partially offset reductions in state funding while increasing financial aid sufficiently to continue the promise of accessibility to qualified California residents.**

The letter went on to recommend the following more controversial tactics:

• **Raising out-of-state and international student enrollments as a greater source of revenue:** This tactic results in substantial net revenue since non-residents’ tuition is roughly double, thereby subsidizing California resident students on roughly a one-to-one basis;

• **Increasing tuition levels uniformly throughout the system to a level that would cover state budget cuts AND maintain quality and fully meet the costs of additional enrollments.** The Chancellors’ letter suggested that the amount of tuition should be roughly doubled, to approximately $24,000 (of course with sufficient financial aid to maintain neutrality with regard to accessibility) in order to restore and maintain the quality of UC education.

• **Allowing individual campuses to impose a premium above the uniform base to provide for appropriate distinctive needs and opportunities, commensurate with market conditions and ability to provide the increased aid necessary to make increases neutral with regard to students with need**

• **Creating a privatization model—through which all or parts of university operations become, in essence, financially self-sustaining.** This self-sustaining mode should be accompanied by a withdrawal of the state from exercising control over internal UC operations, while retaining oversight to insure that the University is living up to its public mandate to provide access for California residents and pursue research and public service to help keep the state on the cutting edge, economically, socially and culturally. For its part, UC would need to make clear that while it was being financially privatized, its traditional public mission would be uncompromised.

• **Converting the State’s subsidy to a fund for financial aid to insure that accessibility at reasonable cost is maintained for California residents.** This fund would enable UC to devote all of the income from tuition to meet education and other general fund needs rather than using it to fund the “Return-to-Aid” program while still enhancing the support for students in need of assistance in order to attend UC.

The University is vigorously pursuing all of the first set of solutions, but only beginning to explore the second. The Regents and the Office of the President seem, understandably, torn between pressing forward on this new agenda and expending all available energy trying to reduce cuts in its budget from the state. This indecision leads to two difficulties. In the short run, it has resulted in increasing tuition by less than the state cuts, producing a growing funding gap, and resulting in the need for mandatory furloughs, faculty and staff attrition and the inability to recruit new faculty at just the time when (due to the reduced funding at most “public” universities) the ability to obtain top flight people is at its apex.

As stated in the letter to Yudof, this approach has had, “… the unfortunate effect of asking students to pay more even as they are getting less—crowded classes, fewer courses, and eroding student services.” Perhaps even worse, the letter concludes, “The additional revenue from tuition increases appears to be enough to keep the University afloat but not enough to sustain its excellence or stabilize its future."

In the long run, the indecision between trying to make an old strategy work more effectively and launching one based on today’s realities, puts off the day when a strategy of privatization, or more
felicitously, self-sufficiency can be effectively implemented.

The Road to Implementation

The proposed strategy would not be easily implemented, as there are many constituencies who would question the impact of major changes on quality and accessibility. The most difficult point on which to obtain agreement, even though the data are very clear, will probably be the continued success of the High Fee/High Aid policy. As the former chancellors stated in their letter to Yudof:

The strategy we propose means that only those who can afford it would pay full tuition—a fact that needs to be clearly explained to students and families. It continues to protect low-income students while making UC more affordable to middle-class students, who are most likely to be squeezed out by rising tuition.

It will be argued that the state can and must once again provide the level of funding on which the assumptions of the California Master Plan were based. If experience is a good teacher, we should certainly question the validity of that argument.

Others will believe that the state will no longer be able to provide proper oversight of the operations of “its” university without the ability to control its management. Many of us who have been involved in attempting to manage all or part of UC will respond that the state’s attempts to “manage” only increased costs and decreased the quality of the results.

Some who believe that the strategy may be a valid one will react quite negatively to the size of the tuition suggested. Study has shown that it will take something on the order of the proposed amount to assure the continued excellence of the University of California. And even with tuition at that level, UC would remain a bargain compared to the most distinguished private institutions, some of which charge undergraduate fees well over $40,000 a year.

Then there is the sensitive issue of privatization, also referred to as self-sufficiency. The fundamental argument will, undoubtedly, revolve around the question of how far we can go in the direction of self-sufficiency and still retain our public mission and character. The best test available on this critical point is that the Universities of Michigan and Virginia have moved very far along this road with apparently little negative impact.

If this, or any other strategy likely to meet the needs of our University is to be adopted, much discussion and argumentation will have to occur. Changes, both good and bad, will undoubtedly be made, but I have as yet heard of no alternative that comes close to meeting the many needs a new approach would have to deal with.

I believe we need to get on with the complicated effort to bring about this new approach. I hope many of you will agree and join in the effort to provide for a UC future not only as great, but even more spectacular than it’s past.

*****

Charles Young is renowned for his leadership as Chancellor of the UCLA campus for almost thirty years (1968-1997). Following his retirement from UCLA in 1997 he served as President of the University of Florida from 1997 until 2003. He has now returned to California and renewed his dedication to the continued excellence of the University of California.
**Letter From The Chair**

_Ernest Newbrun, UC San Francisco_

This will be my last “letter” as Chair of CUCEA, so let me start by thanking all of you for allowing me to serve in this capacity. It has been both an honor and a major responsibility, entailing not only organizing our biannual meetings, attending to other CUCEA business, but also representing the interests and concerns of emeriti at the monthly meetings of University of California Faculty Welfare (UCFW) committee and quarterly at the UC Retirement System Advisory Board. There is a saying that if you enjoy eating sausages, do not watch them being made; to a certain extent that applies to issues related to our health benefits. This is one of the most frustrating exercises since we exert very little influence on these outcomes. National figures report that health insurance premiums have risen 131% over the past decade (1999-2009), whereas general living costs have risen only 28% over the same period. The Office of the President of UC, faced with such ever-escalating health care insurance costs, decided to spread these rising costs to the beneficiaries including emeriti and retirees. Specifically my predecessor Charles Hess, together with Marian Gade, representing the retirees, on the UCOP Post-employment Benefits Task Force negotiated an agreement with UC administration of an increase in our share of the insurance-rate incrementally from about 10% to 30% spread over several years. However it now seems that even these concessions by retirees are insufficient from the point of view of UCOP, which has appointed a new Healthcare Benefits Work Group charged with formulating cost-cutting strategies, including modeling scenarios for holding the University’s per employee contribution for healthcare benefits to minimal increases over each of the next four years. Active employees currently pay 13% of their health benefits. Since health care costs are projected to rise between 8-9% per year over the next four years, the obvious implication of the charge is that UC must either cut benefits or transfer more costs to employees. Hopefully retirees and emeriti will not have to pay more than 30%, but as these health care costs rise so does our dollar amount contribution. This bodes ill for retirees who have no more promotions or merit increases to cushion the blow, imposing a significant cut in our take-home pensions.

In my previous remarks (Newsletter of October 2011) I pointed out that for the first time, UC gets more money from student tuition than from the state and raises the question of when do we cease being a public university and gradually become a private one with some state support. Recently (January 2012) the Chancellor at UCSF has proposed a “new relationship” between UCSF and the University of California that would secure its financial future that the press has referred to as “a split from state university.” UCSF plans to evaluate new growth opportunities for UCSF and explore alternative governance models. I have been asked by colleagues from other campuses what all this means, to which the glib response would be that the current Chancellor at UCSF comes from industry not academia so this might be expected. However UCSF is quite different from other campuses, with a relatively small enrollment of 3,000 students in graduate or professional schools and no undergraduates. It receives only 1 percent of revenues from tuition and only 5 percent of its revenues from the state. Revenue sources for UCSF’s $3.86-billion budget come primarily from clinical income (50 percent) and from research grants (29 percent). The incentive for changes in the financial relationship between UCSF and the UC system is that forecasts show that, without intervention, UCSF’s future is at risk. UCSF’s projected expenses are expected to outpace revenues in the year 2015 due to rising costs for employee pension and benefits, the impact of health care reform, the opening of UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay and costs of making seismic upgrades to facilities. Because of its small student population increasing tuition is not a solution for UCSF, rather it is finding new revenue streams through spinning off successful biotech companies, creating joint venture for an outpatient pharmacy with a for-profit pharmaceutical company and exploring new opportunities on the technology front. Under the Chancellor’s proposal, UCSF’s...
dental, medical, nursing and pharmacy schools, hospitals, clinics and research facilities would remain a public university connected to UC, but as an autonomous organization with its own boards of directors, a relationship like those of UC Hastings College of the Law, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

Let me conclude on a happy note concerning the status of our emeriti and retiree associations that until now lacked liability insurance and while using UC designation in our organizations names, were not legally entitled to do so. We attempted to get blanket recognition for all Retiree and Emeriti Associations’ system-wide through a new Regents policy statement. From the outset I never expected that the Academic Senate would prove to be a stumbling block, but it consists of personalities who have their own agendas and egos. Unfortunately the Chair of the Academic Senate reneged on his promise to consult with each campus senate after we had agreed to drop any reference to emeriti being appointed to Academic Senate committees. After about six months I realized that the proposed Regents Policy 5204 which we had worked on for so long was going nowhere and devised a strategy to by pass Academic Senate obstructionism by having President Yudof write a letter including emeriti and retiree organizations under Regents Policy 5203 which applied to UC alumni and other support groups. Below is President Yudof’s letter to Chancellors, Laboratory Directors and Vice President Agriculture and Natural Resources:

“The University of California wishes to acknowledge the service of former employees who have retired from the University, and recognize the organizations established at our campuses and laboratories whose memberships consist of our former employees. The most common forms of organizations for former employees are emeriti associations (for faculty who have retired) and retiree associations (for staff who have retired). These organizations benefit our former employees in many ways, including but not limited to: (1) encouraging participation in various activities that support the University; (2) providing campus and University-wide assistance; and (3) engaging them in public outreach as well as in general support for the University's mission.

While the Retiree and Emeriti Associations have a long and distinguished history of service to the University, there has not been a formal recognition of the relationship between these groups and the University. Therefore, effective immediately, emeriti associations and retiree associations will be considered "Affiliated Organizations" as defined in Regents Policy 5203: Policy on Support Groups, Campus Foundations and Alumni Associations.

As Affiliated Organizations, formally recognized emeriti and retiree associations will qualify for event liability insurance coverage for events through the FAS (UC-affiliated foundations, alumni associations, and support groups) program offered by the Risk Services Office at Office of the President or any successor program thereto.”

CUCEA extends heartfelt thanks to Ernest Newbrun for his extraordinary service on behalf of UC emeriti during the past two years as Chair of CUCEA. His leadership during a difficult period for the university is deeply appreciated.

CUCEA welcomes W. Douglas Morgan, Emeritus Professor of Economics UC Santa Barbara, as the incoming Chair of CUCEA. He served as CUCEA Chair-Elect for 2010-2012 following a term as President of the UCSB Emeriti Association. His UC experience is impressive: Bachelor’s from UCLA; Doctorate from UCB; Faculty from UCSB; and member of the original Merced Task Force.

CUCEA also welcomes John A. Marcum as the CUCEA Chair-Elect for 2012-2013. Professor Marcum is currently President of the UCSC Emeriti Association. He joined UCSC in 1972 as Professor, Political Science and International Relations, Provost of Merrill Collage, and later as Academic Vice Chancellor. He has a long history with the university-wide Education Abroad Program and served as its Director since 1990.
AWARDS

Honorary Members of the Council of University of California Emeriti Associations

In recognition of exceptional contributions made by individuals on behalf of UC emeriti, the Council (CUCEA) established the position of Honorary Membership in CUCEA (Bylaws, Section I.C.). To date, there have been five individuals elected by the Council to be permanent Honorary Members of CUCEA. Each is recognized below:

Claude Fawcett (UCLA, 1911-1998) played a major role in gaining campus and university-wide representation of UC emeriti interests. He is credited with founding CUCEA, and he became the Council Chair in 1988 (see CUCEA Newsletter April 2011 p.2). His contributions were deservedly recognized in 1995 when the Council elected him by acclamation as the first honorary member.

Moses Greenfield (UCLA) has a long history of participation in CUCEA. He served as Council Chair in 1990 and is especially appreciated for his pioneering efforts to establish the biobibliographic survey of continuing scholarship, teaching and service by UC emeriti in retirement. He was elected to honorary membership status in 1997.

Ralph Nair (ICSB, 1913-2006) was also a dedicated participant in CUCEA, serving as the Council’s Historian for over ten years (1994-2004). The extent of his influence on emeriti interests is well stated in the UCSB emeriti/retiree newsletter (Summer 2006) in a memorial to Ralph on his death in 2006:

“Ralph displayed dedication and a clear vision of what the role and place of emeriti in the body of the University of California should be. Ralph was the historian and institutional memory of the UC emeriti associations, meticulously recording the history of the various campus emeriti associations.”

 Appropriately, at the CUCEA meeting held at UC Santa Barbara in 1999, he was elected by acclamation to honorary membership.

Norah Jones (UCLA, 1921-2010) dedicated some four decades to UCLA as Librarian, and then another 14 years as Archivist for both the UCLA Emeriti Association and CUCEA (1995-2008). In 2009 she received the Lifetime Distinguished Service Award for her manifold and long-continued service to the UCLA Emeriti Association. In 2003 she was elected unanimously Honorary Member of CUCEA. A tribute to her lifetime achievements is published in the July 2009 issue of New Dimensions.

Charles Berst (UCLA) was elected Honorary Member of CUCEA in 2010 in recognition of the exceptional contributions he has made on behalf of UC emeriti through the publication of the biannual biobibliographic survey. He took the pioneering survey work of Moses Greenfield to a new level. The value to the University and beyond of the continuing scholarship, service and professional activities of UC emeriti is impressive. The surveys document this work and bring it needed recognition. The CUCEA website and newsletters give details of the surveys and include delightful musings on the subject of retirement by honoree Charles Berst (http://cucea.ucsd.edu).

CAMPUS AND OTHER AWARDS

UC DAVIS: Alex McCalla, Professor Emeritus of Agriculture and Resource Economics at UC Davis, received the Distinguished Emeritus Award for 2011. His distinguished career at UC Davis with a focus on international trade and agricultural economics spans some 30 years (1966-1995). Following his retirement in 1999 he joined the World Bank and led extensive efforts to enhance agriculture in the developing world. He has now returned to UC Davis and continues to teach and to participate extensively in professional and emeriti/retiree affairs.
Recently Announced 2011-2012 Edward A. Dickson Emeriti Professorship Awards at UC Davis

Peter Hays, Professor Emeritus Department of English, for his “Continued Research on Hemmingway.”

Don Price, Professor Emeritus Department of History, for his studies of “Song Jiaoren and China’s Political Culture.”

Kurt Kreith, Professor Emeritus Department of Mathematics, for contributions in “Mathematics, Technology, and the Secondary School Curriculum.”

Charles Halstead, Professor Emeritus Department of Internal Medicine and Nutrition, for studies of “The Epigenetic Regulation of Development Alcoholic Liver Disease.”

UC LOS ANGELES: Dr. Eric W. Fonkalsrud, Professor Emeritus of Surgery at the David Geffen School of Medicine was honored by the American College of Surgeons at the annual meeting 2011 in recognition of his consummate contributions as a surgeon, investigator, mentor and leader over the past 50 years. His contributions in many key areas include pioneering restorative proctocolectomy and ulcerative colitis. He was one of the first to perform liver transplantation in the United States. He is also a world authority on surgical management of chest wall malformations, gastroesophageal reflux in children and neonatal surgery. He has been a national leader in academic surgery, serving as president of nine national and international surgical societies. He is currently president of the UCLA emeriti association.

UC SANTA BARBARA: Sanford Gerber, Professor Emeritus Department of Speech and Hearing at UC Santa Barbara, received the Aram Glorig award of The International Society of Audiology for Speech & Hearing "a lifelong dedication to Audiology and in recognition of his numerous and valuable achievements for Audiology."

Duncan A. Mellichamp, Jr., Professor Emeritus Department of Chemistry at UC Santa Barbara, received the 2010 CACHE (Computer Aids for Chemical Engineering) Award in recognition of his contributions in the use of computers in chemical engineering education.

UC SANTA CRUZ: James Clifford was elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 2011. He taught in UCSC’s History of Consciousness Department for thirty-three years and was founding director of the Center for Cultural Studies. He is best known for his historical and literary critiques of anthropological practice, travel literature, and a variety of cultural performances. He is currently completing a book about indigenous cultural politics – the last in a trilogy on issues in anthropology and culture.

Frank Drake Professor Emeritus of Astronomy and Astrophysics, was named an honorary fellow of the California Academy of Sciences in 2011. He is the former director of the SETI Institute’s Carl Sagan Center for the Study of Life in the Universe. For over fifty years, he has been asking, "What are the chances of life existing outside our solar system?" This question led Drake to formulate an equation that quantifies the likelihood of intelligent life elsewhere in our galaxy.

The Alexander von Humboldt Foundation elected James Gill, Professor of Earth and Planetary Sciences at UC Santa Cruz, in 2011 to receive a Humboldt Research Award. The award is conferred in recognition of lifetime achievements in research. Recipients are invited to carry out research projects in cooperation with specialist colleagues in Germany. Gill’s research focuses on volcanic activity on the seafloor and the formation of oceanic crust, as well as the origins of the continental crust. Gill was also honored recently by oceanographers who named a large submarine volcano after him. "Gill Volcano" was discovered and named by New Zealand oceanographers, who published their discovery last year.

Harold "Hal" Hyde, UCSC’s first Vice Chancellor of Business and Finance, received the UCSC Foundation’s Fiat Lux Award in 2011 for outstanding achievement and service to the campus. He was a central figure in the founding of the university.
Jean Langenheim, Professor Emerita of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, was elected in 2011 as an Honorary Member of Sigma Delta Epsilon- Graduate Women in Science, its highest honor. Langenheim is an eminent plant ecologist and leading authority on plant resins. She broke new ground for women in science, having begun her career at a time when professional opportunities for women were limited. At UC Santa Cruz, she was the campus’s first female faculty member in the Natural Sciences and the first woman to be promoted to full professor.

The Geological Society of Japan awarded its 2011 International Prize to J. Casey Moore, Professor Emeritus of Earth and Planetary Sciences at UC Santa Cruz, in recognition of his outstanding contributions to the development of geology in Japan. Moore’s research focuses on the structural geology of subduction zones and the active margins of continental plates. He donated the prize money to the Geological Society of Japan to support the organization’s earthquake recovery efforts in the aftermath of the Tohoku earthquake and tsunami.

The California Academy of Sciences awarded its highest honor, the Fellows’ Medal, to John Pearse, Professor Emeritus of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology at UC Santa Cruz. This award is given to especially prominent scientists who have made outstanding contributions to their scientific fields. Pearse is an expert on marine invertebrates with a focus on their reproductive biology and role in the rocky intertidal and kelp forest ecosystems. Although he retired in 1994, he continues to teach, conduct research, and write as a professor emeritus affiliated with UC Santa Cruz’s Institute of Marine Sciences (IMS).

Thomas Pettigrew, Research Professor of Psychology at UC Santa Cruz, was named the 2011 winner of the William Foote Whyte Distinguished Career Award of the Sociological Practice and Public Sociology Section of the American Sociological Association. This award is given annually to individuals who have made notable contributions to sociological practice and public sociology. Pettigrew, is an internationally renowned expert on racism and intergroup relations. In 2009, he received the University of California Constantine Panunzio Distinguished Emeriti Award.

Ruth Solomon, Professor Emerita of Theater Arts at UCSC, was named Honorary Fellow of the Division of Sports Medicine, Children's Hospital Boston, Harvard Medical Center. For the last 30 years she has done annual three-month "residencies" at the Division of Sports Medicine, Harvard Medical Center, Boston.

David Swanger, Professor Emeritus of Education and Creative Writing at UCSC, has been named the Poet Laureate of Santa Cruz County for 2012-13. The position of Poet Laureate is an initiative of the Cultural Council of Santa Cruz County--in collaboration with Poetry Santa Cruz--and is designed to advance, enliven, and promote the art of poetry throughout the county.

October 2011 CUCEA Meeting

The Fall meeting of CUCEA was held at UC Davis, October 26-27 2011. Our sincere thanks go to Center Director Sue Barnes and her staff for organizing an excellent meeting. It has become the custom to hold a joint CUCEA/CUCRA meeting on the Thursday morning session so that issues of collective interest to emeriti and retirees can be addressed, and this meeting was no different. To open the meeting we were welcomed by an exuberant, spirited performance by the Aggie Band-oh Davis Marching Band. Words do not do justice to the energetic excitement of their performance. Serious matters subsequently brought to us by Provost Hexter (UCD) and Office of the President staff (budget woes, increasing health insurance costs, and resumption of retirement contributions) brought us back to reality. Another memorable event was the afternoon tour of the Robert Mondavi Institute for Wine and Food Sciences, including the Busch Brewing and Food Science Laboratory. This incredible institute is a testament to the complex technology of fermentation, whether it be of grapes or grain. A highlight was the entertaining lecture from the Director Professor Charles Barnforth who compared beer favorably with the depth and diversity of wine.

The CUCEA meeting was held in the afternoon. The main outcome to be mentioned here is that the Biobibliographic Survey will now operate on a three-year cycle instead of biannually. The Council voted to change the schedule for budgetary reasons, and to parallel the customary three-year review period for active faculty. This means that the next survey will cover the period from July 2009 to June 2012, and the call for information will likely go out in October.
Getting to Know The Joint Benefits Committee. A Personal Reflection

By Marjorie Caserio, Editor

As a member of CUCEA for some years now, I have many rewarding memories of the reports of the Joint Benefits Committee (JBC) on a host of benefit and retirement issues. It has come to be almost a tradition at CUCEA meetings for Adrian Harris, the first and only JBC Chair, to distribute and comment on the latest JBC report. Even so, while I understand most of the benefit issues JBC brings to the table, I confess to not really understanding the current structure of JBC or how it functions. Apparently I am not the only one. This may be of no consequence except for the fact that CUCEA and CUCRA now have an increasingly active role in representing emeriti and retiree interests; for example, the CUCEA Chair is a member of the UC Faculty Welfare Committee, the UC Retirement System Advisory Board and, until recently, the UCOP Post-Employment Benefits Task Force. It is unclear to me if or how the JBC fits in this activity.

The JBC has been an entity of CUCEA (and CUCRA) for 18 years and, not surprisingly, few CUCEA members remember much about its origins. For this reason and the aforementioned role changes, the time seemed right to take a fresh look at the JBC. Accordingly, a small review group from CUCEA and CUCRA was formed recently for that purpose (Dick Jensen, Pat Pelfrey, Doug Morgan, and Marjorie Caserio). With the help of two founding JBC members, Adrian Harris and Ad Brugger (who sadly has since passed away) we learned that the JBC was formed in 1994 in response to the need for the interests common to both emeriti and retirees to be articulated more effectively to UCOP. The CUCEA and CUCRA Chairs appointed a committee of seven that included two members each from each Council followed by three at-large members to cover needed expertise in areas impacting benefits issues such as law, finance and healthcare. Over the years the composition has barely changed (although Council Chairs are now included ex officio) and even the membership has turned over slowly compared with the Council memberships. This has benefitted the parent Councils by providing continuity and institutional memory. The downside is that JBC’s informal structure was never codified through the bylaws of either Council. To our knowledge, there is no formal record of its mission or description of the committee composition, nomination and election procedures, terms of service, operational procedures such as meeting frequency, minutes, agendas, budgets, reporting practices, or the committees relationship with UCOP on which it has focused most of its attention. Yet the committee is far from dysfunctional, having operated successfully and independently for years. Many of the enhancements in retirement and healthcare benefits can be credited to JBC’s dedication to our interests.

Is there then a problem? None that cannot easily be corrected. Our review group concluded that, because the JBC is an arm of CUCEA and CUCRA and not therefore independent of either Council, it cannot continue to operate indefinitely without some formal recognition by the parent Councils. So, we recommended that the JBC be appropriately recognized by inclusion in the respective bylaws of each Council and provided with sufficient structure and oversight to enable the committee to fulfill its role as an agent of both Councils. Our recommendations were approved (in principle) and bylaw revisions are now in preparation for the Councils review in April. But this is not quite the end-of-story. The JBC has hitherto operated independently and set its own agendas, and hopefully it will retain this independence in a more formalized structure. Continued practice of ex officio nonvoting membership of Council leadership in the JBC will probably be needed to maintain credible independence. A larger question is what happens to a JBC report once it reaches the parent Councils. The target audience is really UCOP—so the custom has been for CUCEA and CUCRA to forward a report to UCOP following each Councils’ independent “acceptance” or “approval”. In my opinion, CUCEA is a rather passive filter of JBC recommendations, partly because of lack of time for discussion during Council meetings and partly because it is not clear (to me) which of the many issues in a report are for information or action. Maybe the practice needs tweaking, but meanwhile, I hope the JBC reports will continue to enliven the Council meetings and ultimately serve us well.
Tips on a Better Quality of Life for Seniors.

Aging inevitably results in the gradual deterioration of our physical well-being. Maybe “slowing down” of our physical mobility is not such a raw deal, but the one dreaded circumstance is the loss of brain function. Alzheimer’s disease and related dementias are increasingly evident among seniors the longer we live; yet few of us relish the prospect of living longer if it means losing the reality of living. Aging is not reversible and there are no cures for Alzheimer’s (yet), but there are ways that can potentially reduce the risk of early memory loss through life-style changes. CUCEA was contacted recently by a recent USC gerontology graduate, Andrea Chin, who brought to our attention a website (http://anti-aginggames.com) that has a series of lifestyle tips culled from 17,000 medical studies on reducing the risk of early memory loss. Apparently this is a subscription site but here are two free tips that make a lot of sense.

Move it! Aerobic exercise is one of the most effective ways to reduce the risk of early memory loss.

Teach your brain new tricks! Keep your brain stimulated through mentally engaging activities because learning helps build new neural connections, even in adults.

In response, we suggest that a good laugh might also help. For example:

My grandpa started walking five miles a day when he was 60. Now he's 97 years old and we have no idea where the hell he is.

I joined a health club last year, spent about 250 bucks. Haven’t lost a pound. Apparently you have to go there!

*************