

THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY

By Marjorie C. Caserio

Professor of Chemistry and Chancellor Emerita

California's budget crisis has hit public education particularly hard. Continuing cuts in core support and the magnitude of these cuts spell catastrophe for the entire UC system unless major changes are made to ensure stable revenues. The precipitous increase in student fees to compensate for the cuts strikes at the core of the University's mission. Questions abound. Why has higher education been singled out for such draconian cuts? Do our elected officials not realize how important education and scientific research are to the state's economy and future well-being? Do the cuts mean that UC's hallmark promise of an affordable quality education for the best qualified has been rescinded? Has this state turned its back on the California Master Plan for Higher Education? Will applicants have to be turned away? Will our campuses have to make up for shortfalls by admitting more out-of-state students who pay higher fees? Will the university fail to retain and recruit the highest quality faculty? What can be done to prevent erosion in quality, access, and affordability — the attributes that made UC a great public university? In short, what will UC become?

The problems expressed in these questions are particularly distressing to former campus administrators — especially the ex-chancellors who led the growth of the UC system from the 1960s onward. In June of last year, a group of 22



former chancellors[†] convened a two-day conference on the future of the University under the joint leadership of **Charles Young** (UCLA) and **Richard Atkinson** (UCSD). The conference culminated in the drafting of a letter to UC President **Mark Yudof** urging the adoption of new funding models. Yudof decided to make the letter public so as to allow for wider distribution. A thoughtfully worded and powerful statement of the situation, the letter can be found on the CSHE website

[†] Sadly, Chancellor **Michael Heyman** passed away in November. His distinguished leadership of the Berkeley campus will long be remembered.

(<http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?id=390>).

I was privileged to participate in this conference even though my one-year tenure as UCSD's interim chancellor in 1996-1997 hardly puts me in the same league with those who had many years of campus leadership experience. Yet it was a great honor to join them and witness how dedicated they remain to the University's mission. I have tried in this article to capture their concerns and to supplement several key points made in the conference discussion that formed the basis of the letter to Yudof.

Background

Articles by conference co-chairs Young and Atkinson (available on the above-mentioned website — papers 349 and 378) provide essential background information and spell out key policy options for the future. As Young observes, the source of the state's budget crisis has been years in the making. The root of the problem can be traced to the initiative process. While this form of direct, participatory democracy was originally introduced by Progressives to overcome the corrupting influence of powerful interest groups, it has had unintended consequences. In particular, a voter revolt over escalating property taxes led to the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 that rolled back property taxes, sharply limited future increases, and transferred authority to allocate the receipts to the state legislature. But Prop. 13 also stipulated that all bills passed by the legisla-

Continued on p.2 →

◆ ◆ ◆ Inside ◆ ◆ ◆

Lucky Lindy and Lucky Me . . .	4
Electronic Education	5
Anecdoteage	7-8
Mark Your Calendar	8

ture to increase taxation had to be approved by a two-thirds super majority in both houses and that municipal tax increases also had to win a two-thirds vote. These additional provisions have turned out to be a recipe for dysfunctional state governance (stalemate, partisan bickering, and minority control) and fiscal crisis at the local level. Proposition 98 (1988) imposed further budget restrictions by requiring that 40% or more of state general funds be spent on K-14 education. Further mandates have tied up still more of the budget in various entitlements and services (prisons, pensions, public safety), leaving higher education the most vulnerable target in periods of declining revenue. Without additional revenues, and with as much as 85% of the budget locked up, the cuts have to be made from the remaining 15% on which higher education depends.

Impact on the University

The state's feast-or-famine budget cycles of the past three decades have made it impossible for the university to rely on the state for sustained support for core academic programs, including enrollment growth and basic cost increases. The result has been accelerated efforts to cut costs and search for additional revenues from non-state sources. However, the message from the Office of the President (OP) at our meeting was that the University has gone about as far as it can to cut costs through actions such as furloughs, layoffs, library cuts, administrative efficiencies, programmatic efficiencies, freezing salaries, curtailing recruitments, cutting classes, and lowering benefits. But the savings have not compensated for the loss in state support. Additional revenue sources are needed, yet increasing revenues through philanthropy, indirect cost recovery, and other internal taxation measures are unlikely to make up the shortfall. The only remaining viable option has been to increase student fees for undergraduate, graduate, and professional students.

As a result, student fees have risen 2000% since 1970 (from \$600 annually in 1970-71 to \$12,000 in 2011-12). The

argument has always been that the fees are low compared to other major public and private universities of comparable quality, and that financial aid is available to those who need it. Even so, the huge recent fee increases, with possibly more to come, challenge this assumption. This crucial point was the focus of discussion at the former chancellors' meeting as they explored options the university could reasonably take to meet the enormous cuts in state support.

One stark conclusion emerged: the notion that UC is a tuition-free public university is no longer credible. To be clear, the "educational fees" we have always charged are now recognized for what they are — tuition. It is a fact that previous tuition increases (and there have been many) have not been a deterrent to enrollments. What has not been stated strongly enough is that the access-affordability issue remains viable only as long as there is adequate financial aid for those who need it. Cal Grants at the state level, Pell Grants at the federal level, coupled with some UC resources, have been the primary sources of financial aid. Nevertheless, every increase in fees is met with student demonstrations and public outcry that UC is becoming a private rather than a public university, or that a UC education is more for the private good than the public good. False as this perception may be, the chancellors recognized the need to counter it by assuring that student fee increases would be imposed only if they are accompanied by increases in and broader access to financial aid, particularly for the large middle-income group that will be hit hard in the current economic climate without more financial aid.

New Funding Models

Inherent in the conversation was the hope that feasible solutions to the financial problems facing the University would emerge. Previous crises induced by state cuts have been weathered without the need for major structural changes in the expectation that conditions would improve. However, the chancellors were largely persuaded by the argument that

the current budget reality could not be addressed by the conventional assumption that as better times come UC's fortunes will be restored. We face a watershed situation. A creative approach to restructuring the University is needed that will make it less vulnerable to fickle budgets and ensure that UC can sustain high quality education and research programs.

The meeting afforded an opportunity to discuss new and previously proposed models. Serious attention was given to the idea of turning UC into a private university. Even now, UC is not strictly a public university. The concept of UC as a taxpayer-supported public university is challenged by the alarming fact that UC now accrues more revenue from student fees than from state appropriations. Rather, UC is a "state-assisted university" that is becoming more private than public. Should the university go all the way and cut ties with the state? The short answer was no to complete privatization that would envision a university system of Stanfords or Caltechs. But some hybrid version of privatization was thought worthy of consideration, including approaches adopted by several other state university systems (Michigan, Virginia, and Oregon) that retain some form of state-university partnership. In fact, privatization of certain UC graduate professional schools is being actively pursued, and UCSF has just proposed a change in its status in UC to allow the campus greater autonomy.

The difficulty in discussing privatization or any restructuring model is that it opens up the question of campus differentiation. The Master Plan codified the differentiation of function among the public segments of higher education, and in turn, the university has held fast to the principle that its nine undergraduate campuses would not be further differentiated. The specter of "flagship" and secondary campuses has been largely avoided, but this could change as campuses struggle to generate new operating funds. Tuition may be uniform, but campus-mandated fees (formerly registration fees) for student services differ by branch. The Regents have approved increasing enroll-

ments of out-of-state students (national and international) to allow campuses to benefit from the higher fees these students pay. However, campuses do not attract out-of-state students equally strongly. Currently, 30% of the freshman class at Berkeley is from out-of-state, whereas it is 3% and less at Riverside, Santa Cruz, and Merced. This being so, campuses are unlikely to benefit equally from the revenues and diversity additional non-state students bring. Another consequence is that as campuses admit more non-state students they will have less space for California residents. While there is little doubt that eligible students will be admitted somewhere, they will be more limited in their choice of campus. This further weakens the concept of campus equality and risks splintering the system into haves and have-nots.

Another prospect for revenue growth is to tie fees to the choice of major. We can all recognize that science and engineering majors cost more than humanities, arts and social science majors, yet UC has steadfastly held to uniform tuition regardless of field or the number of major fields a student studies. This could change. Adjusting fees to educational level is another possibility. Different fee structures by campus for students in professional programs (e.g. law, medicine, management) already exist. Fees for juniors and seniors could be raised to cover the higher costs of upper division programs. Graduate student fees are also in flux, up or down, depending on how much of the cost can be absorbed by extramural funds.

The whole topic of privatization and differentiation of campuses, whether by student composition, enrollment level, spinning off professional schools, campus-based tuition, or philanthropic opportunities proved profoundly uncomfortable for the group to pursue in depth. Everyone could see that its implementation could fracture the university as we now know it. Atkinson states it clearly: "A University of California with tiered campuses — some devoted primarily to research and some to teaching, some more equal than others — is inconsistent with the mission,

the history, and the future of UC." That is not to say that some restructuring of campuses might not be a long-term solution. There is a more immediate challenge for the faculty to restructure the way they deliver instruction, for example, by embracing more internet-based instruction and offering degree programs for part-time students. But building consensus on how to approach privatization, hybrid or otherwise, was out of reach for the group in the brief time available. Instead, sentiment prevailed that UC should continue to partner with the state while finding ways to supplement its support through private means. To this end the conferees reiterated the premise that the high fee/high aid model is the only viable way to preserve quality, access, and affordability for students, now and in the foreseeable future. As students pay more they should get more, not less. And they added an important principle: financial aid should be covered solely by state funds. The funds would in effect be a subsidy by the state for California residents. With these funds going for financial aid, it would be hard to argue that the funds were being used for anything but "the public good" and harder still for the legislature to justify further cuts in education for the children of tax-paying citizens. Importantly, tuition revenues contributed by enrolled students would be used as intended — to support their education. This change would remove the dilemma created because income inequality requires one set of students to pay for the education of another.

The final message is unequivocal. The constraints that prevent the legislature from making real choices about the expenditure of public funds must be removed. Constraints have reduced the discretionary part of the budget to such an extent that the University's public character has been compromised. There is an urgent need to engage the general public and the university community in an informed discussion as to how to restore effective governance to the state.

Outcomes?

It is too soon to tell. We seem to be in a wait-and-see mode. An expenditure

plan approved by the Regents in November is a statement of UC's funding priorities for 2012-13 but would require a \$411 million supplement in state funds for implementation. The plan makes no mention of funding sources should the requested state supplement fail. Meanwhile, there are several initiatives in the wind (including one from the Governor) that, if successful, would raise taxes and earmark the funds for higher education. The validity of Prop. 13 is also being challenged in a lawsuit spearheaded by Chancellor Young claiming it was not an amendment to the constitution but a revision. A revision requires a two-thirds majority, which it did not receive. These are positive signs of growing public awareness of the need to protect public higher education from further harmful outcomes.

Nonetheless, Governor **Jerry Brown's** 2012-13 state budget, recently released, addresses a projected \$9.2 billion deficit in state general funds with a combination of cuts and revenue increases. Hardest hit are health and welfare services (Medi-Cal, CalWorks, child care, Cal Grants, and more). The 2011 cuts to the UC and CSU systems are not restored, but there is some promise of stable revenues in future years as well as a \$90 million supplement to UC as the state's long-delayed contribution to the UC retirement system. However, this all depends on the prospect of increased revenues through taxation. The Governor's tax initiative will be on the November ballot, but if it fails to pass, UC faces a further \$200 million cut. Another unpleasant aspect of the budget scenario is that it places education in competition with welfare for the limited state general funds available, reminiscent of arguments over funding priorities for public education versus prisons in previous years. So far, the Regents have been noncommittal about meeting further cuts with fee increases, but the issue is bound to come up in the near future as the budget discussions evolve. ♦



Lucky Lindy & Lucky Me: A Wartime Encounter

By Robert Hamburger

Professor Emeritus of Medicine

In September 1941, with war raging in Europe, I remember President **Franklin Roosevelt** preparing us for the possibility that we might get involved in it. Leery of war mongering and thinking of myself as a left-wing liberal, I made anti-war speeches on campus. (Like most Americans at the time, I knew that Nazi Germany had adopted anti-Semitic laws but had no inkling of the horrors being prepared for the Jews of Europe.) When we were attacked at Pearl Harbor on December 7th, my attitude changed altogether. I got in my car, drove to New York City, and enlisted in the Army.

I thought I would have the opportunity to train in the Army Air Force since the previous spring I had successfully completed 50 hours of pilot training in the Civilian Pilot Training Program (CPTP) and had been awarded a Private Pilot Certificate. And that's what happened. After aptitude testing I received three months each of Primary, Basic, and Advanced Training and after all that, three more months of fighter-pilot combat training in Tallahassee, Florida.

During the training in Tallahassee as a single-engine fighter-pilot, I moved from the AT-10 to the P-47, which had replaced the P-40s we had passed on to our Australian allies, and which had the largest radial engine (2000 hp) in our fleet. Shortly afterward, I was assigned to Gusap, New Guinea, where I joined the 9th Fighter Squadron headed by the greatest American ace of the war, Major **Richard Bong**. He had just convinced General **H. A. "Hap" Arnold** to replace the P-47 with the twin-engine P-38 he much preferred.

As a result, a few weeks after beginning combat, I sat in the cockpit of a brand new P-38 with the Tech Book in my lap and learned to fly the only twin-engine fighter plane. (Our planes,



Bob with P-38 named "Sonia," and a P-38 in Flight

incidentally, were delivered by women pilots — the WASPs, for Women Airforce Service Pilots — the first of the fair sex to fly combat aircraft and a humbling experience for us male hot-shots!) The book learning paid off. On one of my first combat missions in a P-38, in my very first dog-fight, I shot down my first enemy aircraft. (In later life I almost always never took instruction on how to operate anything that complicated just from a book!) All told, I flew 52 combat missions, before I was shot down in the Philippines — by ground fire, mind you — and luckily fell into friendly hands where I was protected until rescued. (I am not sure of my official total kill count of enemy aircraft. It was probably 3.5 because 5 got you declared an ace.)

My next assignment was to Hollandia, and then on to Biak, an island off the northern coast of New Guinea. That's where I encountered the famous **Charles Lindbergh** — "the Lone Eagle" himself. Because of his isolationist opposition to war preparedness and his admiration for Nazi Germany, FDR had refused to reactivate his status as a colonel in the Air Force which Lindbergh had resigned in April 1941. The only way he was able to get involved in the war was indirectly, as a consultant to military aircraft manufacturers, in this case, Lockheed Aircraft

outside of Los Angeles, where the P-38 was designed in what became known as the company's "Skunk Works."

In this advisory capacity, he managed to make a real contribution to the war effort. Still a fabulous pilot, he figured out how to almost double the time a P-38 could be kept aloft in a mission. This technique enabled us to undertake a mission from Biak to Borneo — well outside the plane's rated range. He was sent to our outfit in Biak to teach sixteen of us how to fly a six to eight-hour mission in a plane designed to be in the air for only three hours. "Lindy" assured us it was OK to reverse the usual power setting ratio rpm/manifold pressure (which was said to damage the engine) and that it would almost double the time aloft without harm to the engine.

So for three days and three nights Lucky Lindy lived with our squadron, sharing a pyramidal tent with our CO, exchanging stories, jokes, and general hanger-flying with us novices. We youngsters found this famous great old pilot a charming, regular guy. When asked, he defended his support for isolationism as "simply an effort to keep us out of foreign wars."

His technique was not without its drawbacks, as we learned in practice flights. It would not destroy the engines

but it left the planes extremely vulnerable at that airspeed. Nevertheless, a few days later, when weather permitted, we successfully flew a mission protecting the B-24s over the targeted oil fields in Borneo (the major source of fuel for Japan). The mission took over six hours in a P-38 rated at three hours with a $\frac{3}{4}$ hour reserve. Twelve of the sixteen of us landed with fuel gauge reading “empty” with only fumes in the tank. Three of our sixteen planes ditched at sea with two of the pilots rescued by Navy submarines specifically spaced to rescue Army pilots who ran out of fuel short of home. We lost one additional pilot who ran out of fuel on final approach and crashed in flames at the edge of the runway. The top brass were so delighted with the success of our mission that we all received Letters of Commendation. Lindbergh insisted that all the credit went to our skilled piloting. He left the 5th AF, 9th FS the next day and we never saw him or heard anything more about him after that.

My hero, **Dick Bong**, was not so lucky; they sent him home to exploit his fantastic record by having him promote the sale of war bonds. He went to work for Lockheed and was killed on 6 August 1945 flight-testing an experimental jet aircraft, the P-80 “Shooting Star,” when it exploded. He bailed out, but was not as lucky as I had been, and was too low for his parachute to deploy. He died the same day we dropped the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima. ❖

Emeriti Website

The UCSD Emeriti Association maintains a website: <http://emeriti.ucsd.edu>

Clicking the NEWS, PROGRAMS, & MEETINGS button will allow you to view past issues of this newsletter. The website also provides the constitution and by-laws, lists of members, and minutes of meetings.

Electronic Education: Calculating the Costs Along with the Benefits

By Stanley Chodorow

Professor Emeritus of History

The Academic Senate and the Office of the President have been inviting proposals for “distance education” courses, in response to budget shortfalls but also to calls for higher education to join the modern e-world. E-universities are said to be more efficient than antiquated bricks-and-mortar institutions. They use time better and don’t need all those costly buildings. Advocates admit that the faculty who teach the courses need a few of those costly buildings, and that some classes, such as labs, cannot be taught online, but they think that online programs will reduce the cost of education at no loss in quality. I’ve been involved with the use of technology in teaching for more than 30 years and have given a lot of thought to the subject. The conclusion I have been led to is that electronic education is a useful adjunct in a number of respects but no substitute for old fashioned, live teaching and learning.

Already in the late 1980s, it was clear that the campus network would become a medium of education. We could see that if education occurs where people meet face-to-face — in classrooms, laboratories, hallways, at campus eateries, on walkways, and lawns — it can also occur where they meet electronically. That foresight was accurate.

In the mid-1990s, I went to the University of Pennsylvania as provost, arriving just as the Internet was emerging from its esoteric stage. A few colleagues at Penn were already using the new medium to educate. A professor of English jury-rigged the early computer game *Dungeons and Dragons* to create an online “castle” in which each poet assigned in his American poetry course had a room, attended by a TA, where students could discuss that poet’s work. At the center of the castle was a playroom, where the class



collectively wrote a poem of its own using the styles of the poets on the syllabus. Students were enthusiastic participants in this project, and they learned a great deal about American poets while arguing over whether a particular line was really like **Dickinson** or **Frost** or **Stevens**.

That experiment and others excited me about the educational possibilities of the new technology. Observation of the pioneering courses showed that the Internet could intensify the intellectual experience of a course, and since then new tools for collaboration and intra-group communication have realized that benefit of technology. What also became clear almost immediately was that the use of such devices would intensify the teacher’s as well as the students’ experience of a course. If you can get students to respond more frequently and more thoughtfully to what you are teaching, you will also be engaged more fully than you were when teaching consisted only in leading seminars, giving lectures, and holding office hours.

At Penn, we did not contemplate the creation of purely online courses; we were experimenting with classroom education enhanced by electronic resources and the media that transmitted them. But the idea of education purely by electronic means was spreading rapidly by the time I returned to San Diego in 1998. That year, I became head of the

Continued on p.6 →

Chodorow from p.5

California Virtual University, a consortium of public and private universities to create purely online programs. Governor **Pete Wilson** had promoted the idea, which led universities, especially the public ones, to get involved. In service to the consortium, I travelled around the state talking to faculty members and administrators about online programs and to national meetings about the promise and techniques of distance education. I learned a lot, but the learning curve was short as well as steep. When Wilson left office in 1999, the CVU collapsed.

Since then, in retirement, I've been teaching general education courses in the traditional lecture/discussion section format enhanced by electronic resources and media. I've created narrated slide lectures and historical geography movies and used discussion boards. This term, I'm using Google Docs to create a forum for students to comment on selected texts they read in Revelle Humanities.

Ten years ago, I took one step beyond the electronically enhanced course. I gave a summer version of a Making of the Modern World course and, with CEP approval, held discussion sections online, using an electronic discussion board. I required students to contribute to the discussions three times a week. At the beginning, I got a lot of "me too" responses when someone made a contribution, not much different from the way many students behave in classroom discussions. I took those students "aside" by private email, telling them that I would not count such responses as participation. By the end of the second week, students were making real contributions almost all the time, and by the end of the course I thought the discussions were among the best I had ever seen in a class. In the final lecture, I took time to discuss the experience with the students. They said that they hated it, because they were forced to pay attention and to work at contributing to the discussion. My assessment of the experiment was, of course, the opposite of theirs.

Electronic "spaces" are effective places for interaction, and the people

interacting can be very distant from one another. My experience and that of others shows that the physical campus is no longer the only place for education. Yet, the lessons I've taken from my experiences and observations make me doubtful about the current enthusiasm for distance education. I don't think universities will save much money in online programs, because the classrooms that can be replaced by electrons are among the least expensive spaces on campus and because the measures of excellence in education are closely tied to the quantity and quality of interaction between faculty members and students.

Our standards look first to the quality of the inputs — the quality of the faculty and of the students admitted to the institution — and then to the quality and quantity of work we demand of students and of the interactions between teachers and students. Online programs can meet almost all of these standards. They can hire a first-rate faculty, admit first-rate students, and demand a lot of high-quality work from students. What they cannot match is the quality and quantity of student-teacher interaction. Interaction is critical to learning, which is why we ask students about it in CAPE and other assessments of teaching. In addition, our obsession with student-teacher ratios stems from the recognition that a teacher can respond well only to so many students. The quality of education relates directly to the time available for interactions, much more than to the personalities and talents of the teachers. Exchanging ideas with students takes more time online than it does on campus.

When I first started thinking about the use of electronic technology, I could see that it would force us to learn new time-management techniques. Before the electronic revolution, we organized our teaching by specified hours in class and in our offices. In the early days of the Internet, the few students addicted to computers would fire off emails or post comments to list-serves throughout the day and night. Answering the emails or posting a comment in response was not a great burden. Five years later, virtually all

students had the addiction, and we had a flood of electronic communications to deal with, a high percentage of them having only nuisance value.

Yet, a substantial proportion of emails and posted comments do have educational value, and our responses to them do enhance our effectiveness as teachers and the quality of our courses. Instead of answering a student's question in our offices, we can now broadcast good questions and answer them for everyone in the course. Our best students are contributing more than ever to the education of their peers. But I spend more time teaching than I did 15 years ago, which is fine if you don't have to go to meetings and don't have colleagues waiting to see your latest publications. It can be a problem if you are 20 or 30 years from emeritus status.

For all faculty members, there is now a mismatch between their schedules and those of their students. Faculty members manage blocks of time measured in days and hours for research, teaching, and administrative work; students manage time in minutes or less. We are used to things taking noticeable time; they think things happen in milliseconds. We emeriti may have a greater problem with the new order of time management than our youngest colleagues, but time management is now a significant problem for everyone, because the old tools — class schedules and office hours in particular—have lost their solidity.

In distance education — unconnected to time and place — those tools don't exist at all. Education by those means tends to be chaotic. When students expect to "go" to lecture and to "talk" to you at any time of day or night, you can feel as if you are a target in a shooting gallery. You can decide to answer emails or post comments on the class discussion board only at particular times, but in the liquid temporal environment of the Web that behavior seems artificial, even unnatural, and it's hard to sustain. In 1998, I talked to a faculty member at Berkeley about the way electronic media would increase his interaction with students. He said, "You mean this stuff will make it

possible for students to contact me at any time?" I said, "Yes." He said, "Bad idea." I often think of that exchange when I see another email from a student in my inbox or remember that I have to look at the class discussion board.

Managing time so that faculty members can do the research that forms the foundation of their teaching and students can distribute their time among the courses they are taking is not the only problem in the electronic environment. Properly managed, online lectures and presentations, such as slide lectures or lab demonstrations, can be kept up to date and can communicate what we want students to learn as effectively as classroom versions. In principle, other things being equal, an online course can be just as effective as courses that meet in a classroom. However, the other things are not equal.

First, the size of classrooms limits the number of students a teacher has to deal with. To limit the size of online courses, we must install an arbitrary enrollment cutoff. I have not seen a strong argument for an ideal student-teacher ratio that could be used to defend such a cutoff, and the economic pressures that have made online education such a hot topic will make it almost impossible to defend a ratio faculty members would regard as good. So, the first problem with online education is that the students would overwhelm the faculty member, if he or she were actually teaching and not just providing "learning modules." (Whoever came up with that term should be disinterred and left for the hyenas.) Online education is not more efficient than classroom education except when it is not really education. The teacher-student ratio matters, and, given what has happened in the last 40 years, it should be thickened rather than diluted. Online courses are more efficient users of time and space than classroom courses, but they are not more efficient users of teachers, the most important resource in education.

Second, the dropout rate of almost all online programs is outrageous. Only certificate programs, which offer an immediate financial benefit, do reasonably well on

this score. When I was leading the California Virtual University, only UCLA's extension program was taking serious measures to combat the high dropout rate in its online courses. Course assistants were hired to keep track of enrolled students, help them with technical matters, and call them when they had not participated in the course for a specified period. UCLA had by far the lowest dropout rate among the programs I saw, but it also spent more on its programs than other institutions did. Notwithstanding students' engrossment in the electronic world and their finely sliced and diced schedules, they do not keep up with coursework without the crutch of required or expected attendance at a class or without being prodded. So, if we are going to educate them by electronic means, we must invest in human shepherds, enough of them to keep the flock moving in the desired direction. Most shepherds have two or three dogs to assist them.

Third, is electronic interaction as effective as face-to-face interaction? Can we teach and learn really well by email and discussion board absent classroom interaction? I doubt it. We communicate by language, by tone of voice, by facial expression, and by body language. Even for intellectual business, disembodied language is not sufficient. Some people seem to have forgotten that teaching and learning have a strong emotional component. Our disciplines and fields of study did not capture us; our mentors did. In the electronic world, our students are faceless and ageless, literally disembodied. Perhaps today's students can and do create powerful emotional bonds through electronic media without face-to-face contact. If so, distance education might work. But the generations of students to come might shrink significantly.

Fourth, spending a number of years on a campus educates students in many ways beyond what we do in classrooms and labs. Students learn from their dorm mates and friends; they participate in clubs and associations; they share what they learn with peers in activities of a phenomenal variety. All societies have created institutions to educate and form

their offspring in age groups. I wonder how we would do that if a substantial percentage of our late adolescents never gathered for periods of instruction and formation but only for rock concerts and sports events.

If distance education is done right — that is, if it arises from research and is designed to create and maintain interaction between teacher and student — then it is education as we understand the idea. But, I doubt that even the best distance education can be as good as that experienced on a campus; I doubt that it will save a significant amount of money; and I doubt that society will benefit from it as much as it has from colleges and universities embedded in time and space. ♦

Anecdote

By Sandy Lakoff

Ben and Jerry's came up with a special flavor for the presidential inaugural in 2008:

Yes Pecan!

What will they serve up for 2012?

Middle of the Rocky Road?

♦ ♦ ♦

The Wall Street Journal's Saturday Review section showcases some of the sprightliest prose in print these days. Two samples from a recent issue:

More Guts than Brains? **Jonah Lehrer**, in "The Yogurt Made Me Do It," reported on research showing that rodents fed probiotic bacteria, typically found in yogurt, were more emotionally stable than other laboratory rats in stressful situations. Presumably the bacteria in the stomach get to the brain, where they increase the number of receptors that regulate emotions. Extrapolating to humans Lehrer concludes logically: "There's nothing metaphorical about 'gut feelings,' for what happens in the gut really does influence how we feel." (Maybe that

Continued on p.8 →

Anecdote from p.7

explains why Greeks don't pay taxes: all that Greek-style yogurt produces the neurological ailment known as taxophobia.)



Tricks of the Tradesmen: **Martin Lindstrom**, a marketing consultant, reports on the artful stratagems supermarkets use to get us to load up on their wares. At Whole Foods, flowers in glorious profusion festoon the entrance to the store and their prices are scrawled on fragments of black slate, just as in outdoor markets in Europe: "It's as if the farmer or grower had unloaded his produce, chalk and slate boards in hand, then hopped back in the flatbed truck and motored back to the country. But in fact, while some of the flowers are purchased locally, many are bought centrally, and in-house Whole Foods artists produce the chalk boards." And all the big supermarkets sprinkle some of their select vegetables with "little dew drops of water." Why? Like chipped ice put under bottles of juice to make them seem fresh, "those drops serve as a symbol, albeit a bogus one, of freshness and purity. (That same dewy mist makes the vegetables rot more quickly than they would otherwise.)"



Men's Views of Men

He is simply a shiver looking for a spine to run up.

—Paul Keating

Some cause happiness wherever they go; others, whenever they go.

—Oscar Wilde

He uses statistics as a drunken man uses lamp-posts... for support rather than illumination . . .

—Andrew Lang

He has Van Gogh's ear for music.

—Billy Wilder

Women's Views of Men

The more I see of men the more I like dogs.

—Madame de Stael

If men could get pregnant, abortion would be a sacrament.

—Florynce Kennedy

The only time a woman really succeeds in changing a man is when he's a baby.

—Natalie Wood

Marriage is a great institution, but I'm not ready for an institution yet.

—Mae West

—from *An Uncommon Scold*, compiled by Abby Adams (Simon and Schuster 1989)



Mark Your Calendar!



Mary Walshok

Associate Vice Chancellor, Extended Studies
**Innovation and Job Creation:
Why Research Universities Matter**
Prospective Emeriti Reception
(\$20 p./p to the EA) Wednesday, February 8
Reception 3:00 p.m.; program 4:00 p.m.

**Frank Ferris, Scott Irwin, Kathleen Pacurar,
Charles van Gunten**

Hospice and Palliative Care in the 21st Century
Wednesday, March 14, 3:30 - 5:30 p.m.

Green Faculty Club

Chronicles

Newsletter of the UCSD Emeriti Association



Sanford Lakoff Editor (slakoff@ucsd.edu)
Jeff Calcara Layout and Design

Officers

Ann Craig President
Richard Nelesen Vice President
Phyllis Mirsky Secretary/Treasurer
Richard Attiyeh Past President; Awards

Executive Committee

Members at Large: **Wolf Berger, Matthew Chen, Charles Kennel, Carmel Myers, Mel Green, Fred Randel**

Ex-Officio: **Robert Hamburger**, Historian; **Kirk Gardner**, Liaison to UCSD Retirement Association; **Sandy Lakoff**, editor, *Chronicles*; **Suzan Cioffi**, Director, Retirement Resource Center; **Maxine Bloor**, Liaison to Oceanids

Forward queries, changes in mailing/e-mail address to **Suzan Cioffi**, Executive Director, UCSD Retirement Resource Center, 0020, UCSD, 9500 Gilman Drive, 92093-0020; telephone (858) 534-4724 • emeriti@ucsd.edu