Hello again fellow emeriti/ae.

I want to ask you: are you engaged?

This is not a matrimonial inquiry, but it is important. It is about you and UCI and your communities.

Last year, our Chancellor and Provost announced a strategic plan for UCI. One goal focuses on "engagement" and a key subgoal is to facilitate the engagement of emeriti/ae with the campus missions of research, teaching, and service.

Since Fall 2016, the UCI Emeriti/ae Association has been actively developing proposals to support this goal. The ten ideas listed below have emerged from discussions by the UCIEA Executive Committee, by meetings I have had with each UCI School Dean, from an assessment by the UCI Senate Council on Faculty Welfare, Academic Freedom and Diversity, and from ongoing discussions with the Engagement subcommittee of the campus’ Academic Planning Group. Fortunately, I am a member of the latter two groups and thus have kept the conversation going in those settings.

The following is a list of suggestions as to how UCI leaders at the campus, school and student levels might act to engage more fully with emeriti/ae.

1. Each School: Create and maintain a current inventory of the School’s emeriti/ae regarding:
   a. their emeriti/ae’s willingness to mentor graduate students, undergraduate students and/or junior faculty
   b. the topics on which they are willing to speak to classes, colloquia, or off-campus groups

2. Each School: Provide School or department-level support for emeriti/ae regarding:
   a. individual or shared office space for emeriti/ae at the School level or, even better, at the level of large departments
   b. limited research support, such as photocopying and clerical assistance

3. Each School: Highlight the accomplishments of emeriti/ae via:
   a. the periodic School-level website report
   b. an annual School-level report specifically discussing the accomplishments of emeriti/ae during the previous twelve months

4. Each School: Hold a yearly reception sponsored by the Dean to recognize the contributions of emeriti/ae during the previous twelve months

5. Each School: Encourage department chairs to hire emeriti/ae with high quality teaching skills to offer at least one course per year

6. Each School: Recall one emeriti/ae faculty member with a modest stipend to take the lead in building cases for honors and awards for that School’s faculty (e.g., membership in national academies, national research book/paper prizes, etc.)

7. Each School and the Academic Senate: Facilitate the increased participation of emeriti/ae on School and campus committees

8. The Associated Graduate Students and ASUCI: Identify opportunities for emeriti/ae to serve in support/advisory roles for campus graduate and undergraduate organizations, clubs and programs

9. Campus Level: Allocate central funding for one recalled faculty member to serve as a campus-wide counselor and advocate (on topics such as communications, resources, participation, retirement planning, etc.) for all emeriti/ae and soon-to-be emeriti/ae (as UCLA, among others, has done).

10. Campus Level: Establish policies that reduce occasional on-campus parking costs for emeriti/ae

11. Your idea goes here… (send it to me for consideration).
The carpe diem pitch: I encourage each emeritus/a to consider his/her own preferences for engagement with UCI and the community. If there are activities that are of value to you, identify what you are doing and what you can do to ensure that you make the most of them. If you chose to be invisible, so be it. But if you want to be active and if a Dean or Chair asks what you are doing, what you want to do, or invites you to an event -- the kinds of actions we promote in the above list-- I hope you will respond constructively.

I also hope you will find some of the articles in this Newsletter of interest. Ken Kraemer traces the rise and fall of UCI’s Graduate School of Administration; George Miller chronicles the history and issues regarding our own on-campus nuclear reactor; and we offer an “Issues” reflection on the privatization of our university.

As always, I welcome your input.

Jim Danziger
President, UCI Emeriti Association

THE MILLENNIALS REPLACE THE BOOMERS

You are Invited to Attend
UCI EA Annual Meeting and Lecture
The Millennials Replace the Boomers: A Boon or a Curse for US Democracy?

Please join us for breakfast, business and an engaging time with colleagues.

Thursday, June 8
10 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.
Newkirk Alumni Center
(Mesa Road and University Drive)

Please RSVP for complimentary parking and refreshments to: emeriti@uci.edu or 949.824.7769

Event Agenda:
10:00 - Business update + Outstanding Emeritus/a Award
10:30 - Guest lecture, Emeritus Professor Russ Dalton
11:15 - Q & A Session
A Nuclear Reactor has existed in the basement of Rowland Hall since its construction in 1967-68!

This facility was added in support of research by Nobel Laureate (later in 1995) F. Sherwood (Sherry) Rowland, the founding chair of the Chemistry Department. Funded by a US Higher Education Facilities Act grant, it was included as a single line in the proposal to expand the basement facilities in the first Physical Sciences building – the first to be added in the second phase of the building of the campus. Sherry selected me as the first Supervisor of this reactor, a position I hold to this day.

I was in charge of all the procurement, architectural changes, and licensing with the Atomic Energy Commission. The fueling and raising to its first operation was accomplished in November 1969 with a certain amount of local fanfare. I was the first and only licensed operator, but soon trained two of Rowland’s graduate students to assist me. One, Pat Grant, is in the photograph above along with me. Pat is now a senior scientist at Livermore National Laboratory, and has co-authored a text on Nuclear Forensics.

UCI’s nuclear reactor uses the unusual property of uranium that “splits its atom” easily when absorbing a neutron to release more neutrons and a lot of energy. This reactor is licensed to release a total of 250 kilowatts of energy every hour. Sadly, this energy cannot easily be harnessed to provide electricity for the campus – but scientists are interested in the spare neutrons that can be used to create radioactive atoms, starting with stable ones.

Sherry Rowland’s group used these atoms to study high energy chemical reactions in gases and liquids. Today, several groups at UCI and others at UCLA and elsewhere use the radioactive atoms to track chemical separations or to find out the concentrations of traces of chemicals in complex substances. An early recruit to chemistry at UCI was Vincent Guinn, who was a world renowned expert at using nuclear methods to examine crime scene evidence. In 1974 he was asked to re-examine the fragments of the bullet that killed President Kennedy, concluding that these could indeed have originated from a single bullet, contrary to other claims that other bullets may have contributed. My students have used the method to examine a wide diversity of materials from art, archeology, and geology to aid in identification of sources and provenance. Others have looked for pollution residues in many different realms. Still others are exploring ways to make new kinds of radio-pharmaceuticals that can better assist in medical diagnostics. And some are involved in exploring better methods to characterize a nuclear explosion should one unhappily be set off.

**Is it safe?**

This type of reactor has a special arrangement of its fuel, invented by General Atomic around 1953, to make it a totally safe reactor. Interestingly, the design was largely the idea of Edward Teller, more recognized as “the father of the hydrogen bomb”.

Freeman Dyson, a recent visitor to UCI, described this development process as follows*:

> "Teller was in charge of this group and insisted that a safe reactor must be one that “could be given to a bunch of high school children to play with, without any fear that they would get hurt.” Further, that “engineered safety was not good enough” and the reactor fuel should have inherent safety. In other words, under the possibility that its control rods could be totally removed, yet the reactor would end in a stable condition with no fuel melting, was adopted as a guiding principle."

*Freeman Dyson, Disturbing the Universe, Basic Books 1979, Chapter 9, pp 94-103, “The Little Red Schoolhouse.”
THERE’S A WHAT... — continued

The fuel was developed and performed exactly as desired. As many as 60 reactors around the world, mostly at universities, have been built using this fuel. So any type of accident releasing radioactivity, such as has happened with large nuclear power reactors at Chernobyl and Fukushima, is physically impossible.

What about living close to the reactor in University Hills -- do we get more radiation? No increase can be measured – and we do check! Actually you get more radiation exposure if you have concrete walls, dry-wall boards, coffee beans, or even people in your house, than from the operation of our reactor.

How about security?

As a result of terrorist threats (actual or perceived) around the world since 2001, there are concerns that any facility containing radioactivity could be sabotaged or material stolen to create an especially unpleasant attack device. Actually, no such event involving radioactive materials has occurred so far, though some subversive materials have been intercepted at international borders. Extensive analyses by security experts place the facility at UCI in the lowest category of “attractiveness” for illicit activities. Nevertheless, we have instituted many precautions controlling access and providing extensive surveillance around the clock. This proves difficult, with several students needing access to carry out their experiments, and they now must be “cleared” to enter. The UCI Police Department has received special training in appropriate response to any attempt to violate our security perimeter.

All in all, UCI’s nuclear reactor has been a unique and successful asset to the Chemistry Department. I am proud of its accomplishments. This year its license was renewed for the next 20 years. After almost 50 years, I trust my successors to maintain it in excellent condition and to develop and exploit it in new ways for the benefit of several areas of important research.

George Miller, Senior Lecturer Emeritus, School of Physical Sciences

UCI EMERITI SPOTLIGHT:

Margot Norris  English and Comparative Literature 2016-17 Constantine Panunzio Distinguished Emeriti Award

Daniel Tsang  Library Recipient of Fulbright Scholar Grant in Hong Kong

Congratulations to these distinguished UCI Emeriti!
In discussing the future of the University of California, one hears comments about “privatizing” the university. But what does this really mean? Privatization generally means shifting public sector provision to a private provider, regardless of revenue source. “Privatizing UC” is a bit different, but it can be thought of as moving away from public revenue support with implications in both financial and management terms.

Financial concerns have been driving the university in the direction of a private university for several decades. The share of the UC operating budget provided by the State of California has steadily decreased. Today the total tuition paid by California resident undergraduates exceeds the State’s contribution to UC. At UC Irvine (excluding the health sciences, contracts and grants and auxiliary enterprises), the State now contributes less than 30% of the cost of operating the general campus. If health sciences, contracts and grants and auxiliary enterprises are included, then approximately 10% of the cost of operating the entire campus is provided by the State. Realistic projections suggest this percentage will continue to decrease. One reason for this continued decline is that the State continues to expect UC to enroll more undergraduate students while providing less than the marginal cost of instruction.

Extrapolating from this trend, in the foreseeable future UC will become essentially financially independent of the State. Because of the declining State financial contribution, UC has had to diversify its revenue sources. Many options have been exploited to increase non-State revenue. Each of these additional revenue sources has implications for the nature of the university.

The most obvious source is an increase in tuition for California resident students. A growing proportion of the cost of instruction is shifted from the State to students and their families. The university’s response to this shift is an aggressive financial aid system that alleviates the financial impact of high tuition on low income students. A greater reliance on this high fee, high financial aid model can be expected in the future.

In discussing the future of the University of California, one hears comments about “privatizing” the university. But what does this really mean? Privatization generally means shifting public sector provision to a private provider, regardless of revenue source. “Privatizing UC” is a bit different, but it can be thought of as moving away from public revenue support with implications in both financial and management terms.

A second option has been to enroll more non-resident students, who are charged substantially higher tuition than California residents. Less than a decade ago non-resident undergraduate enrollment at UCI was negligible. Today non-resident enrollment has increased to approximately 20% of UCI’s undergraduates and the proportion is even higher at UCB, UCLA and UCSD. The non-resident tuition paid by these students at UCI generates nearly $150 million annually. Financial concerns rather than academic values motivate this increase in non-resident undergraduates.

Third, UCI’s campus administration actively encourages departments to create self-supporting graduate professional programs that generate net revenue to benefit other campus priorities such as supporting academic Ph.D. students. It is the goal of producing revenue that motivates most of these new graduate professional programs, arguably more than any societal needs or academic concerns.

Fourth, UCI is increasing the charges to faculty, staff and students in such areas as parking, student housing and other non-academic services. And the campus is increasing indirect cost assessments on extramural contracts and grants and auxiliary enterprises as a form of cost sharing (or cost shifting).

And fifth, the campus will continue to expand its dependence on philanthropic and corporate support. This requires increased investment in fund-raising staff, marketing and branding, corporate relations and technology transfer. Acknowledging the priorities of donors without unreasonably modifying the academic priorities of the campus will be a growing challenge. For example, should the university accept an endowed faculty chair in an academic area that is not a high priority? How about researchers changing their focus to chase private money?

As the costs of financing a public university are shifted from the state, management issues arise that resemble those facing private universities. Many great private universities such as Harvard, Stanford, Chicago, etc. have successfully balanced the priorities of high quality academic programs with these diverse and mainly privatized funding sources. Can UC achieve the same balance?
ISSUES CORNER— continued

A major limit on the university’s ability to replicate the success of the great private universities may be UC’s governance structure, which is defined by the California Constitution (in Article IX, section 9). The Regents are provided the full powers of organization and management, subject to legislative control, to ensure security of funds, compliance with terms of endowments, and competitive bidding. The Board of Regents is comprised of only one faculty and one student representative, plus 7 ex officio members and fully 18 members appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate majority. Because the Governor and the legislature control the appointment of most Regents, the university’s policies are often subject to political priorities. Creating an independent board to govern UC, requiring an amendment to the state Constitution, is very unlikely.

What does the future hold? UC will continue to evolve its financial model to resemble that of a private university, but the governance structure will continue to resemble that of a public university shaped by political influence. The necessity of the former is constrained by the reality of the latter. True privatization is improbable; but the nature of UC will inevitably change in that direction, compelled by the financial realities of seeking more and more non-state money. Should the university evolve to resemble a private university? Is this evolution inevitable? Can a public university ever be truly private? What does a public university gain and lose by going private? These are intriguing and important questions.

WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO THE GSA AT UCI?

In 1965, UCI established the Graduate School of Administration (GSA). It was to be a new kind of school—a "generic" school of administration—different from then existing schools of business and public administration. The generic approach evolved from a perception in academic disciplines that the emerging concepts of human relations, communications, operations research, statistical decision theory and behavioral science were as applicable to a hospital as to a bank, to a department store as to a government bureau.

GSA was ensconced on the penthouse floor of the first Humanities building—a reflection of its lofty promise. Not one of the ten first faculty had received his/her PhD from a business school. Rather, they were from graduate programs in international relations, sociology, social psychology, math and statistics, and public policy, consistent with the idea behind GSA.

The early years of GSA went well, until a series of incremental changes occurred that highlighted flaws in the model and led to its abandonment. The incremental events were membership in the AACSB, the interests of key groups in the public and private sectors, the name change of the school, the introduction of the MBA, and finally, abandonment of all degrees but the MBA.

In 1969, GSA joined the AACSB (American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business) with the intention of seeking accreditation. GSA's common core included courses in organizational behavior, quantitative analysis, finance, economics and accounting. Area courses related more to business or government, such as business strategy and public policy. The small number of faculty meant that one could not teach core courses for each area, such as both business finance and public finance, or managerial accounting and also public budgeting. Future AACSB accreditation meant that the business versions of the core courses would be taught first and the public sector versions would be added later—as the school grew. The new faculty hired to teach these business core courses were from business schools.

Most students entering GSA were interested in the business side; only a small number were primarily interested in public administration. Local recruiters, whether from business or government, were focused on graduates with business knowledge and skills. The degree name, Master of Science in Administration, was confusing to recruiters who were looking for graduates with conventional MBA degrees. To some, “administration” seemed to convey low level activities whereas “management” was associated with high level activities.

In 1965, UCI established the Graduate School of Administration (GSA). It was to be a new kind of school—a “generic” school of administration—different from then existing schools of business and public administration. The generic approach evolved from a perception in academic disciplines that the emerging concepts of human relations, communications, operations research, statistical decision theory and behavioral science were as applicable to a hospital as to a bank, to a department store as to a government bureau.

GSA was ensconced on the penthouse floor of the first Humanities building—a reflection of its lofty promise. Not one of the ten first faculty had received his/her PhD from a business school. Rather, they were from graduate programs in international relations, sociology, social psychology, math and statistics, and public policy, consistent with the idea behind GSA.

The early years of GSA went well, until a series of incremental changes occurred that highlighted flaws in the model and led to its abandonment. The incremental events were membership in the AACSB, the interests of key groups in the public and private sectors, the name change of the school, the introduction of the MBA, and finally, abandonment of all degrees but the MBA.

In 1969, GSA joined the AACSB (American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business) with the intention of seeking accreditation. GSA’s common core included courses in organizational behavior, quantitative analysis, finance, economics and accounting. Area courses related more to business or government, such as business strategy and public policy. The small number of faculty meant that one could not teach core courses for each area, such as both business finance and public finance, or managerial accounting and also public budgeting. Future AACSB accreditation meant that the business versions of the core courses would be taught first and the public sector versions would be added later—as the school grew. The new faculty hired to teach these business core courses were from business schools.

Most students entering GSA were interested in the business side; only a small number were primarily interested in public administration. Local recruiters, whether from business or government, were focused on graduates with business knowledge and skills. The degree name, Master of Science in Administration, was confusing to recruiters who were looking for graduates with conventional MBA degrees. To some, “administration” seemed to convey low level activities whereas “management” was associated with high level activities.
WHAT EVER HAPPENED TO... — continued

In 1981, the School changed its name to the Graduate School of Management (GSM) and introduced the MBA degree. The MBA was one of three degrees (along with MPA [Master of Public Administration] and MBPA [Master of Business and Public Administration]) to assuage those who still believed in the generic model. The job market continued to favor business graduates and even more so in conservative Orange County. At a critical point when the School was considering whether to keep the Master of Public Administration, city and county managers indicated that “they would hire an MBA over an MPA anytime.”

This external environment had internal impacts on students and faculty. For graduates of the School, there was a differential of about $5-7,000 in the starting salaries of those with an MBA versus an MPA. When first-year students in public administration saw this reality, they began to switch to the business degree.

As more faculty were hired, there was an increasing tendency among the core faculty, which comprised about half the faculty in the program, to have a business bias. The bias was an outgrowth of two reinforcing tendencies: (1) the large number of business-oriented students who demanded business relevance in core classes; and (2) the growing number of faculty in economics, finance, management science and organizational behavior who had received their doctoral educations in business schools.

It became increasingly difficult to achieve and retain a critical mass of faculty in public administration in the face of different student demand and a growing proportion of business faculty. There was constant tension between faculty assigned to business and public administration, with the latter continually fighting for some kind of parity in courses, and losing. As a result, nearly all of the few faculty on the public administration side left GSM when the school formally abandoned the generic model and changed to giving only the MBA degree in 1985.

Thus UCI had a Graduate School of Administration from 1965 to 1981, when it was renamed a Graduate School of Management. In 2005, it was renamed the Paul Merage School of Business to acknowledge a donor and complete the shift of focus. Of about a dozen “generic” graduate schools of administration that existed in the seventies, none remain today. An extended discussion of the limitations of the generic model can be found in Kenneth L. Kraemer and James L. Perry, Camelot Revisited: Public Administration Education in a Generic School, In Guthrie S. Birkhead and James D. Carroll (Eds.), Education for Public Service, 1980. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, 87-102.

Ken Kraemer, Professor Emeritus, Merage School of Business

In Memoriam:

We honor and note the passing of the following colleagues:

Paul Arthur Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering – March 18, 2017
Krishna Tewari Molecular Biology & Biochemistry – March 17, 2017

FULL list at our In Memoriam webpage: http://sites.uci.edu/emeriti/in-memoriam
OTHER UPCOMING EVENTS

May 17  **EVENT - Health & Wellness Fair**

May 18  **BIKE RIDE - Newport to Sunset Beach 9:00 a.m.***

May 23  **EVENT - UCI Retirees & Friends Anne Paden Memorial Golf Tournament**
This event is for golfers at all levels and held at the beautiful Arroyo Trabuco Golf Club in Mission Viejo.
RSVP for further details and registration form found at this link: [http://retirees.uci.edu/](http://retirees.uci.edu/)

June 13  **BBQ COOKING CLASS at Anteater Recreation Center**
*Sponsored by UCI Retirees Association

June 8  **Annual Emeriti Meeting — Thursday 10:00 a.m.**
Outstanding Emeriti Award and Lecture on Millennials and Boomers
@ The Newkirk Alumni Center, 450 Alumni Ct., Irvine.
Complimentary Parking with RSVP to [emeriti@uci.edu](mailto:emeriti@uci.edu) in Lot 14. [Map here](#)

---

**UC Irvine Emeriti Association**

c/o: The UCI Center for Emeriti and Retirees
450 Alumni Court, Irvine, CA 92697-1225
Email: emeriti@uci.edu
[http://www.sites.uci.edu/emeriti](http://www.sites.uci.edu/emeriti)