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Putting People to Work and Getting Our Governmental Budgets in Order Are the Twin Domestic Challenges Now Confronting American Politicians and Policy-Makers. At the Root of These Problems Is Increasing America’s Competitiveness Through Better Education, Training, Health Care, and Housing While Maintaining Law and Order and Taking Care of Our Elderly, Our Needy, and Our Children. Over Three-Quarters of the Federal Budget and Three-Quarters of the California Budget Are Devoted to Human Resource Expenditures for These Purposes. The Goldman School’s Scholars Have Contributed Significantly to Understanding and Improving Social Programs, and This Issue Highlights Some of the Work Being Done in This Area.

One of the Exciting Things Happening in California is “realignment,” which attempts to sort out the responsibilities between state and local governments that got entangled after the quick fixes that followed the 1978 passage of Proposition 13, when state government had to step in to make up for the revenues lost from the property tax limits in Proposition 13. The result of these fixes was a separation between the level of government financing a service and the level of government providing the service. In “New Realities for Social Policy,” our graduates, students, and Professor Steven Raphael talk about what realignment means for their work.

In the “Student Perspective,” Mark Reinardy (MPP Candidate ’12) focuses on one of the more controversial elements of realignment—the proposal to send parolees and many non-violent and non-sex offender inmates back to jails in counties where they will be closer to their homes and family and where they can be supervised more cheaply. Reinardy worries about whether the localities will have the funding to take on these responsibilities. Another major worry is who should be sent back and how should state corrections’ officials reassign the prisoners who remain to the various kinds of prisons, ranging from high to low security? Professor Raphael is working with PhD student Sarah Tahamont (MPP ’09) to develop the best statistical model of how to make these decisions to minimize risks.

A great deal of other fascinating work on social policy is going on at the Goldman School. Rucker Johnson studies how early childhood poverty or racial discrimination affects life outcomes in educational attainment, employment, income, and health. John Quigley, Steve Raphael, and Rucker Johnson have all studied the spatial mismatch between where poor people (especially minorities) live and where the jobs are. Jesse Rothstein studies the productivity of K-12 educational systems and the ways that they could perform even better. Jane Mauddon has looked at how foster children make the transition from foster care programs to the adult world, and she has proposed ways to improve that process. David Kirp has studied all levels of education—pre-school, K-12, and higher education—and made proposals for transforming children’s lives. Richard Scheffler studies how the supply of doctors could better match the needs of our society. Rob MacCoun has written on how the organization of “junior high” can affect student’s performance and outcomes as they move from childhood to adolescence. Jack Glaser works with police chiefs and others to minimize problems arising from racial stereotyping. Sean Farhang looks at the effectiveness of different legal regimes for fighting discrimination. And Robert Reich writes on how social inequality in America affects America’s competitiveness.
"I’m very concerned about the devolution of responsibility from the state to the counties."

- Amy Lemley (MPP ’98)

Amy reflects that California’s budget realignment, along with its general economic malaise, will change how advocacy is done.

“We were able to make a lot of public policy gains when there was more money,” she says. “Now that times are worse, it may be time to turn to other strategies.”

“There’s a tension between when to choose policy collaboration versus legal adversarialism,” she says. “Unless we can find a way of ensuring these people are protected, we’re going to be cut as far back as we legally can be.”

Professor Raphael observes that sometimes the very budget constraints that are squeezing programs can also drive innovation. “In the last two years, there’s been increasing consensus about the need for corrections reform,” he says. “But the current economic crisis has brought the opportunity cost of spending on corrections into much starker relief. The demand for change and reform has been out there for a while, but the budgetary pressures served as a catalyst for change.”

IN MAY 2011, the Supreme Court mandated that California needed to solve its problem of overcrowded prisons — and solve it quickly.

“California corrections is in a unique position,” says Professor Steve Raphael, a corrections policy expert and author of Do Prisons Make Us Safer? The Benefits and Costs of the Prison Boom. “The courts have deemed that the State’s overcrowded prisons are violating the Constitution’s ban against cruel and unusual punishment. At the same time, California is facing extreme budgetary pressures that make options like building and staffing more prisons untenable.”

California’s legislative response to this crisis has been to pass AB 109, part of a sweeping budget realignment that will shift $6.3 billion in revenue from the State to local levels for various criminal justice, social services, and mental health programs.

In general, the term ‘realignment’ describes the process of reviewing state and local government programs and assigning responsibilities to a level of government more likely to achieve good outcomes,” says Aaron Edwards (MPP ’97) who works on realignment at the Legislative Analysts Office (LAO), along with Brian Brown (MPP ’03) and Anthony Simbol (MPP ’98). Aaron is the expert on budget and policy issues related to correctional health care, in-prison rehabilitation programming, and local public safety. “In the context of California correctional policy, realignment describes the shift of responsibility for certain lower-level offenders, parole violators, and parolees from the state to the counties on a prospectively basis effective October 1, 2011,” he says. “Under the realignment plan, offenders who previously would have been sentenced to state prison will now serve their sentence in a county jail and/or under local community supervision. In addition, certain offenders released from prison will now be supervised in the community by county agencies (such as county probation) instead of by state parole agents.”

“We’re on the cusp of very large reforms that will, frankly, impose more of the burden on the counties,” says Professor Raphael, who is working with other researchers to advise the California Board of Corrections on corrections reforms.

“The hope is that counties will be more selective in the use of incarceration if they know they will face a greater marginal cost and that they would be more innovative about long-term incarceration of people whose crimes are not as serious.” (read about Mark Reinardy’s internship working with public safety realignment from a county perspective, p. 11).

Aaron agrees. “Public safety realignment represents a drastic departure from business as usual in California,” he says. “The greatest challenge is anticipating all of the pieces that need to fall into place for successful implementation and head off potential problems before they arise. Despite these challenges, realignment has tremendous potential to address many of the systemic problems that have plagued California’s correctional system for years, many of which are driven by prison overcrowding. If implemented properly, realignment has the potential to both reduce costs and improve public safety outcomes.”

While criminal justice represents a large part of the CA’s budget realignment, 52% of the total funding realigned in FY 11-12 is comprised of health and human services, with even a larger share slated for future years.

Without Homes. Together with John Burton Foundation for Children and Youth, and Los Angeles have a critical mass of advocates who understand that social service programs like those for foster youth have measurable outcomes that show that they are a good return on investment for taxpayers,” she says. “But smaller counties are more limited, both in infrastructure and financial resources. When these counties are shoved in a financial corner, they will exercise their discretion to use the money for these programs for other things.”
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Without Homes. Together with John Burton Foundation for Children and Youth, and Los Angeles have a critical mass of advocates who understand that social service programs like those for foster youth have measurable outcomes that show that they are a good return on investment for taxpayers,” she says. “But smaller counties are more limited, both in infrastructure and financial resources. When these counties are shoved in a financial corner, they will exercise their discretion to use the money for these programs for other things.”

Amy points out that CA’s budget realignment will also reduce California’s Prop 98 obligation, which mandates that a percentage of the State’s general budget must go toward K-14 education.

“By taking a big chunk of money out of the general fund and pushing it down to the county level,” she says, “the state will reduce its Prop 98 obligation by $2 billion dollars. That’s taking a lot of money out of public education.”

Noelle Simmons (MPP ’98) is a Deputy Director at the San Francisco Human Services Agency. As such, she monitors the impact of state and federal budgets on the Human Services Agency and the nearly 100,000 people it serves in the City and County of San Francisco. “With regard to the realignment of social service programs, the unanswered question is whether counties will be given sufficient funding and flexibility to realize the promise of improved and more cost-effective service delivery,” says Noelle. “It remains to be seen whether the sales tax revenue being reapportioned to counties will be adequate to cover the actual cost of providing services.”

Past experience with 1991 realignment suggests that counties are at great risk of having growth in service costs and demand outstrip revenue growth, she says. “The state has been gradually disinvesting in social services programs for years. As a result, counties are already in a position of having to choose between service reductions or picking up the unfunded costs with scarce local dollars.”

Noelle notes that resources for the state’s neediest are already allocated unevenly, depending on the resources available at the local level. She fears that realignment will only exacerbate this inequity.

Amy agrees. “Big counties like San Francisco and Los Angeles have a critical mass of advocates who understand that social service programs like those for foster youth have measureable outcomes that show that they are a good return on investment for taxpayers,” she says. “But smaller counties are more limited, both in infrastructure and financial resources. When these counties are shoved in a financial corner, they will exercise their discretion to use the money for these programs for other things.”

Amy reflects that California’s budget realignment, along with its general economic malaise, will change how advocacy is done.

“We were able to make a lot of public policy gains when there was more money,” she says. “Now that times are worse, it may be time to turn to other strategies.”

“There’s a tension between when to choose policy collaboration versus legal adversarialism,” she says. “Unless we can find a way of ensuring these people are protected, we’re going to be cut as far back as we legally can be.”
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The National Budget Problem

BY JOHN ELLWOOD

IF ONE BELIEVES THAT the United States’ budget deficit is too large or if one is concerned with the rise in the size of the outstanding US public debt — and if one is unwilling or unable to significantly increase revenues — then one has to control or reduce the rise in health care spending that has driven the expenditure side of the budget over the past decades. In short: to the extent that the United States budget has a spending problem, it has a health care spending problem.

Spending on federal programs is controlled in three general ways. Traditional programs — labeled Discretionary Programs — require an annual appropriation. This appropriation (most often contained in one of the 13 Annual Appropriation Bills) grants legal authority that allows an entity (most often in the bureaucracy) to enter into a contract. These contracts are referred to in budget jargon as Obligations. When these contracts are fulfilled the government makes a disbursement. The sum of those disbursements over an accounting period — let us say the Fiscal Year — are referred to as Outlays.

While all disbursements require a grant of Budget Authority — budget authority is increasingly granted via a formula contained in the basic authorizing statute of the program, rather than an annual appropriation. This type of spending is labeled Mandatory Spending. To control the amount of spending (outlays) of these Mandatory Programs, the Congress has to change the formulas in the basic authorizing statutes of these programs.

Just to make things more complicated, there are a few Mandatory Spending programs (Food Stamps and Medicaid for example) whose spending is governed both by a formula and by an annual appropriation. These programs are often labeled Appropriated Entitlements. In most cases these are means-tested programs that provide benefits for the poor.

Approximately one half of Discretionary spending is for defense programs and one half for domestic programs. Pure Mandatory Programs provide non-means-tested benefits.

Although the oldest mandatory program is the commitment to pay the interest on the public debt, since the New Deal what are often called the middle class mandatory programs (or entitlements) have come to dominate US federal budget spending. The largest of these is Social Security, and closely followed by Medicare and Medicaid (an appropriated mandatory program).

It is often claimed that the aging of the US population is driving the amount of outlays for the large mandatory programs. This is the case for Social Security spending but not totally true of the two large health care programs — Medicaid and Medicare. Although the aging of the population has affected these health care programs, the major factor driving health care spending has been the rise in health care costs above the general inflation rate (referred to as health care inflation).

The US Health Care Spending Problem

Students of public health and health care generally begin their analysis of the health care system by looking at three outcomes of any care system. To what extent does it provide access to its citizens? What is its cost? And what is the quality of the service provided by the system?

Cost: Just under half of all US health care spending occurs in the public sector. One might be tempted to blame the inefficiency of the public sector for the growth in health care spending in excess of GDP growth. Unfortunately, the entire US health care system has not been able to control health care costs. In 2008 the United States spent 16 percent of its GDP on health care. Among industrial democracies the next largest percentage is found in France, which in 2008 devoted 11.2 percent of its GDP to health care.

Moreover, as seen in the Kaiser Family Foundation figures (right), the rate of growth of health care spending has been more rapid in the United States than in other comparable countries.

Access: Currently over 16 percent of Americans do not have health insurance. And many studies have shown that those without health insurance have poorer health status than those with insurance.

Quality: It is also the case that for all the resources devoted to providing quality health care, positive health care outcomes are not that high in the United States. Thus according to the CIA World Fact Book (2011 estimates), the US ranks 34th among UN member states in terms of life expectancy at birth. For years defenders of the US Health Care System pointed to the superb quality of US Medical Schools, research centers, and teaching hospitals. Although international comparisons are not available, recent studies of health care quality by scholars such as Dean Steven Shortell of the UC Berkeley School of Public Health have called into question the quality of health care in the United States.

The Goals, Promise and Future of the Affordable Care Act

The main legislative achievement of the first two years of the Obama Administration was the passage of the Affordable Care Act (ACA). It is clear that the main goal of the ACA is to significantly reduce the number and percent of Americans who lack health insurance. Most observers think that it will be successful in this effort. It will do so by dramatically increasing the Medicaid program and by eventually implementing an individual mandate requiring most firms and individuals to obtain health insurance or pay a fine (tax). Lower income individuals and small businesses will also have a subsidy to allow them to afford insurance. Taxes will be raised to cover most of the costs of this subsidy.

It is not clear, however, whether the ACA will significantly reduce national health care expenditures. The ACA requires a series of changes — most notably the creation of the Independent Payment Advisory Board (IPAB) and health care exchanges that are aimed at using market forces to control costs and to increase quality. Another major goal of the ACA is to move from fee-for-service to another payment method — most likely capitation.

Many of the other ACA provisions are aimed at improving the quality of medical care. The required Health Exchanges are aimed at providing increased choice to consumers so that they can choose among various plans to meet their needs. A key little-noticed provision is that if the new system fails to control costs, the IPAB is given the power to limit services and/or providers. (These actions can be overturned by Congressional action.) In effect, this will dramatically
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Michael Nacht is the policy lead on a new $25 million grant from the US Department of Energy to the UC Berkeley Department of Nuclear Engineering. Its aim is to establish the Nuclear Science and Security Consortium intended to conduct research and training on nuclear science and security.

He is chair of the university-wide International Strategy Task Force to advise on a new international strategy for the university. Professor Nacht has recently given invited talks on national security at Harvard’s Kennedy School and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and was a featured panelist at the UC Berkeley Matsu Forum on the impact of the 9/11 attacks on the United States.

Rob MacCoun’s new evaluation of the Dutch cannabis coffee shop system has just been published in the journal, Addiction. A new study of how citizens translate between attitudes and dollars (in the context of child support decisions) was recently published in Law and Human Behavior. He has recently given talks at San Francisco City Hall, Stanford Law School, Yale Law School, the University of Illinois, and the Goldman School and partnered with UCB’s political science department and the Commonwealth Club for a conference in Sacramento on Financing California: Strategies for Fiscal Housekeeping. In early October, Dr. MacCoun gave a paper at a conference in Moscow on the collapse of the Soviet Union 20 years after the coup attempt.

David Kirby was recently named as a Champion for Children by the education policy nonprofit First Focus. Other 2011 awards include Senators Patty Murray (D-WA) and Robert Menendez (D-NJ).

Robert Reich addressed Berkeley’s freshman class at UC Berkeley’s convocation ceremony in the Greek Theater. On September 1, he gave the opening lecture at the International House’s globalization lecture series. On September 7, he gave the Distinguished Lecture at the University of Iowa. On November 15, he will give the annual Mario Savio Memorial Lecture at UC Berkeley.

Jesse Rothstein’s research has been cited extensively in media stories about President Obama’s jobs plan, including Slate, Salon, Huffington Post, and CNN. He briefed lawmakers on Capitol Hill about teacher evaluation and also took his research findings to Sanders where he spoke to state policymakers at “UC in Sacramento.”

Henry Brady and the Goldman School partnered with UCB’s political science department and the Commonwealth Club for a conference in Sacramento on Financing California: Strategies for Fiscal Housekeeping. In early October, Dr. Brady gave a paper at a conference in Moscow on the collapse of the Soviet Union 20 years after the coup attempt.
afghanistan became a focal point of the administration, cuts to defense spending were on the table. the negotiations brought two politically controversial issues to the forefront: troop levels in iraq and afghanistan and military retirement reform. in june 2011, president obama stated that the u.s. would begin reducing troop levels in afghanistan by the end of 2012. this shaped how the congressional budget office (cbo) calculated the long-term cost of the war. if all u.s. troops were out of afghanistan by 2014 (a date circulated in the media), the cost added to the budget by the war would drop precipitously. if, however, one assumed (as cbo did in its baseline analysis) that troop levels in iraq and afghanistan would remain relatively constant over the next ten years, the defense budget would grow significantly.

as a result, the troop levels in iraq and afghanistan became a focal point of the defense budget negotiations. the department of defense vehemently objected to the perception that budgets, rather than realities on the ground, would drive u.s. presence in those countries. both outgoing secretary of defense robert gates and the incoming secretary leon panetta stated publicly that to cut the defense budget now would have serious ramifications for both the ongoing wars and long-term u.s. security. in addition, the budget negotiations created an opportunity to discuss reforming the military retirement system. under the current system, those persons who serve in the military on active duty for 20 or more years can retire with a pension (equivalent to approximately half of the base salary of the last three years of service) and lifetime health insurance. such a system creates an incentive for individuals to stay in the military for 20 years, regardless of whether or not the military requires his or her skills, and thus increases the long-term personnel costs for the department.

as the negotiations developed, the national security division of the omb worked closely with defense department analysts to ensure that the budget reductions, while difficult, would not significantly harm ongoing operations. while neither of these issues was fully resolved by the time i left omb, my internship gave me valuable insight into the federal budget process and how to most effectively utilize increasingly limited resources. g

carolyn.chavez@berkeley.edu

by mark reinardy mpp candidate ’12

the proposed solution, known as public safety realignment (ab 109/117), went into effect on october 1, 2011. the legislature transfers responsibility for certain low-level offenders and parolees from the state to the county. county public safety officials are generally positive about the plan’s philosophical underpinnings. it has long been believed that the key to reducing recidivism — the rates at which people reoffend once released — for low-level convicts is intensive monitoring and rehabilitation by county departmental staff that know the local issues.

the sticking point, unsurprisingly, is in funding. in june, the california state association of counties (csac) finalized a mechanism to distribute state funds to counties that heavily weighs the number of county residents serving time in state prison that fall under the legislation’s purview. as such, counties with disproportionately high numbers of residents sent to state prisons stand to receive a larger relative share of state funding.

this summer, as a fiscal policy intern in the san francisco mayor’s budget office, i served on a countywide team that developed the mayor’s implementation plan and managed its budget. despite being home to 2.5% of the state’s total adult population, san francisco accounts for just 6% of the state inmate population projected to be affected by realignment.

under the csac methodology, the county will thus receive only 1.4% of the total state pool of nearly $400 million dedicated to realignment activities. by contrast, san bernardino county makes up 5.3% of california’s total population, but accounts for 7.4% of the state’s prison population; under the csac allocation, the county receives 7.3% of state funds.

from the perspective of san francisco (and counties like alameda with similar proportional numbers), the allocation system punishes localities that have worked hard and invested significant resources in minimizing their impact on the state prison situation by funding in-custody jail programs, building robust probation departments, and creating effective human service networks. in so doing, they argue, they have saved the state money, and are now being expected to take on large increases in workload without sufficient funding. of course, it’s logical that counties receiving the greatest number of inmates will need funds immediately to reopen or create jail capacity in the midst of dire local budget situations. at the heart of the debate, however, is a tension between dedicating california’s scarce resources to merely transfer the burden of overcrowding from the state to the local level versus restructuring the corrections and rehabilitation system in the state for long-term sustainability.

careful weighing of these priorities is crucial going forward, as state revenues continue to look sluggish despite some what sanguine initial projections for 2011–2012. an improved model for decentralizing state activities, both in public safety and in the prospective realignment of human service provision, will be central to maximizing policy effectiveness in the state’s new fiscal environment. g
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by carolyn chu mpp candidate ’12

it’s hard to imagine a federal government office where the fiscal year 2012 budget negotiations were more salient than the office of management and budget (omb). in the national security division where i was working as an intern, the tension surrounding the negotiations was even more acute—for the first time since the clinton administration, cuts to defense spending were on the table. the negotiations brought two politically controversial issues to the forefront: troop levels in iraq and afghanistan and military retirement reform. in june 2011, president obama stated that the u.s. would begin reducing troop levels in afghanistan by the end of 2012. this shaped how the congressional budget office (cbo) calculated the long-term cost of the war. if all u.s. troops were out of afghanistan by 2014 (a date circulated in the media), the cost added to the budget by the war would drop precipitously. if, however, one assumed (as cbo did in its baseline analysis) that troop levels in iraq and afghanistan would remain relatively constant over the next ten years, the defense budget would grow significantly.

as a result, the troop levels in iraq and afghanistan became a focal point of the defense budget negotiations. the department of defense vehemently objected to the perception that budgets, rather than realities on the ground, would drive u.s. presence in those countries. both outgoing secretary of defense robert gates and the incoming secretary leon panetta stated publicly that to cut the defense budget now would have serious ramifications for both the ongoing wars and long-term u.s. security.

maximize and enhance their educational experience. the opportunities available to students are vast and diverse. in addition to their rigorous academic coursework, many students elect to work with community-based organizations, school districts, government agencies, and non-profits. others take on leadership positions within student government as members of the graduate assembly or even serve at the student regent level representing the entire university of california student body. many gssp students also lead gssp student clubs. the impact they can have in any of these areas is transformative.

in spring of 2011, several policy matters journal (pmj) members attended the 14th annual travers conference on ethics and accountability sponsored by uc berkeley’s department of political science. the conference included experts who discussed and provided strategies on how to deal with the california budget situation in four sectors that make up the largest part of california budget: criminal justice (13%), higher education (14%), health care (20%), and k-12 education (40%). the event inspired second-year mpp students — danny yost, pmj’s editor-in-chief, and enrique ruacho, pmj’s business manager — to think outside the box and leverage the travers conference to build synergy between the department of political science and goldman school of public policy, and ultimately, to bring critical issues to the attention of california legislators and policymakers.

after serving on a countywide team that developed the special edition of the policy matters journal was born. the students worked collaboratively with faculty to produce a special fall edition of pmj summarizing the discussions and findings of the travers conference. the pmj team shared the special edition with key policymakers in sacramento at a conference, which they hosted on oct. 18, 2011 called, “governing california: a discussion at the capitol.” the conference included panel sessions on key issues and featured a keynote address by speaker of the california state assembly, john a. perez.

by carolyn chu
IN 1964, MARK HOFFMAN (MPP ’75) TRAVELED TO MALAWI as a Peace Corps volunteer. This past summer, he and his wife, Roberta, returned to that country to work with the Malawi Children’s Village, an orphanage founded by three former Peace Corps volunteers. Policy Notes asked him to share a bit about his experience.

Why did you decide to return to Malawi?

In 1995, three Peace Corps volunteers who had served as teachers in the same years that I served returned to Malawi and saw firsthand the extent to which HIV and AIDS had ravaged the nation. With a total population of 12 million, Malawi had over a million orphaned children.

In response, they founded the Malawi Children’s Village (MCV) to take care of orphans who came from villages that were within five kilometers of MCV. MCV feeds, educates and oversees the medical needs of the orphans. When the kids become 17, they are given vocational training in sewing, brick laying, carpentry, or auto repair.

Roberta and I decided to volunteer for a month. I have a business background, so I taught the older students about basic business practices while Roberta, a nurse, worked in the clinic.

What was most challenging about your time in Malawi?

Most rewarding?
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In 1964, Mark Hoffman traveled to Malawi as a Peace Corps volunteer. This past summer, he and his wife, Roberta, returned to that country to work with the Malawi Children’s Village, an orphanage founded by three former Peace Corps volunteers. Policy Notes asked him to share a bit about his experience.

Why did you decide to return to Malawi?

In 1995, three Peace Corps volunteers who had served as teachers in the same years that I served returned to Malawi and saw firsthand the extent to which HIV and AIDS had ravaged the nation. With a total population of 12 million, Malawi had over a million orphaned children.

In response, they founded the Malawi Children’s Village (MCV) to take care of orphans who came from villages that were within five kilometers of MCV. MCV feeds, educates and oversees the medical needs of the orphans. When the kids become 17, they are given vocational training in sewing, brick laying, carpentry, or auto repair.

Roberta and I decided to volunteer for a month. I have a business background, so I taught the older students about basic business practices while Roberta, a nurse, worked in the clinic.

What was most challenging about your time in Malawi?

Most rewarding?
event highlights

Senator Graham speaks with students

Senator Bob Graham
Last spring, former US Senator and Florida Governor Bob Graham addressed the UC Berkeley community on “Oil and Money: The Twin Crises of 2010 (and how public policy can protect our vital interests).” Last year, President Obama appointed Senator Graham as Co-Chair of the investigation of the BP Oil Spill and to the Financial Inquiry Commission.

Wildavsky Forum 2011
Professor David Cutler of Harvard University addressed “The Coming Transformation of American Medicine” at the 2011 Aaron Wildavsky Forum on Public Policy. Professor Cutler drew on public and private efforts to improve medical care quality and analyzed them in light of recent legislative developments. The forum is sponsored annually by the Goldman School and honors the memory of Aaron Wildavsky, GSPP’s founding dean.

Cal Day 2011
Panelists (from left) Professor Paul Pierson (Political Science); Richard “Dick” Beahrs (Trustee, UC Berkeley Foundation and panel moderator), Dean Henry E. Brady and the Honorable Roger E. Dickinson, Assemblymember, California State Assembly, 9th District addressed “Can Americans Be Civil and Work Together to Solve Public Problems?” at Cal Day 2011. The event was sponsored by the Cal Class of 1968, the Center on Civility & Democratic Engagement at the Goldman School of Public Policy and the Charles & Louise Travers Department of Political Science.

Commencement 2011
Congresswoman Barbara Lee of California’s 9th District was the featured speaker at GSPP’s 2011 Commencement. Congratulations, Graduates!

Jason Furman Visits GSPP
White House economics policy advisor Jason Furman visited the Goldman School in October to discuss President Obama’s jobs plan and the economy.

From left: Professor Will H. Dow, Professor Richard Scheffler, Professor Rucker Johnson, Professor David Cutler, Governor Jennifer Granholm, Professor Lee Friedman, Dean Henry E. Brady

From left: Professor Christina Romer, Professor Jesse Rothstein, Dean Henry E. Brady, Jason Furman
The Goldman School of Public Policy Alumni Association Board of Directors welcomes two new members, Bonnie Berk (MPP ’74) and Jackie Bender (MPP ’11). Both bring important experience and perspectives to the board, Bonnie as a founder of a Seattle-based public policy consultancy and Jackie, in her first post-graduate position in Oakland working in a policy arena that faces both budget challenges and sweeping change — health. Re-elected to the board were Bill Hederman (MPP ’74), Rob Letzler (MPP ’03/PhD ’07), and Stuart Drown (MPP ’96).

Leaving the board are Christine Koronides, (MPP ’70), who has been active in organizing alumni in the Washington, D.C. area, and Beth Faraguna (MPP ’06), who has served not only as chair of the alumni activities committee, but as Secretary/Treasurer of the Board as well. The school, faculty, students and fellow alums have benefited from their leadership and the hours they’ve devoted to alumni activities. This year marks the board’s first meeting of the year on October 1, and looks forward to helping GSSP during the 2011–2012 school year. For more information about the board, visit http://gssp.berkeley.edu/alumni/gppsa_index.html or contact gppsa_chair@lists.berkeley.edu.
GSPP Donors  July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011
silver society Frank Neuhauser

BY INCLUDING GSPP IN HIS ESTATE plans, Frank Neuhauser (MPP ’93) joins GSPP’s Silver Society. “My wife Anita and I are committed to the long-term success of the Goldman School,” he says. “That success requires financial support for graduate students in an era where state support is eroding. We hope our contributions to GSPP will continue the School’s effort to draw students from a broad range of applicants who are dedicated to public policy and public service.”

Frank Neuhauser is the Executive Director of the Center for the Study of Social Insurance on the UC Berkeley campus.

from the desk of Annette Doornbos

GSPP’s “High-Touch” Approach — What It Means to Alumni and Friends

Annette Doornbos is the Assistant Dean of External Relations and Development

“GSPP is a high-touch program. Professors and staff devote themselves to the students’ experience. That’s the GSPP signature and it is resource-intensive, and a key reason I support the school.” — Pamela Brown (MPP ’91), Executive Director, Office of Planning and Analysis, University of California, Berkeley.

Pamela Brown, GSPP alumna and seasoned member of UC Berkeley’s administrative leadership, recently met me for coffee. At the start, I thanked her for her recent very generous gift — her first — to support the School. What motivated her to give at this time? I asked. Pamela has that “force of nature” feeling about her — positive, engaged and incisive. She recounted her experience serving on the campus committee charged with facilitating GSPP’s 2010 External Review. As she went over the School’s data on how it allocates resources, she was struck by the commitment to offering a resource-intensive “high-touch” program that combines actual policy experience with constant faculty advising and mentoring. “With the experiential learning and ongoing faculty review and advice, I had the optimal career preparation,” says Pamela.

“Plus, I gained an instant support network of faculty and alumni up graduation. I know now just how expensive it is to run a program with those values. Making a gift felt like the best way to acknowledge what it did for me and to keep it going for others.”

Since Pamela graduated in 1991, the GSPP experience has added even more new, high-touch dimensions, with a dozen student groups that further involve faculty and staff attention and facilitation. Against the backdrop of diminishing state resources, the Pamela Brown epiphany has never been more relevant.

Annette Doornbos
Annette Doornbos is the Assistant Dean of External Relations and Development
Pamela Brown (MPP ’91), Executive Director, Office of Planning and Analysis

GSPP’s Student Services team & faculty support two dozen student groups.

Asian Americans & Pacific Islanders in Public Policy
Berkeley Common Cause
Berkeley Public Finance Club
Blacks in Public Policy
Criminal Justice Policy Group
Distance Running in Public Policy
Environmental Policy Group
Goldman Health Policy Group
Goldman Latin/Hispanic Speaker Series
GSPP Progressive Caucus
Interdisciplinary Graduate Student Committee on Youth Policy
International Public Policy Group
It’s a Public Policy
Net Impact - Goldman Policy at Work
Politics in Public Policy
Policy Works in Training
Queer Issues in Public Policy
Social Entrepreneurship Club in Public Policy
Students in Nutrition and Agriculture Policy
Students of Color in Public Policy
The Illustrous Policy Student Instructors
Very Social Policy
Women in Public Policy
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Center for Environmental Public Policy (CEPP)

High-Speed Rail — Villain or Savior? CEPP Advances the Dialogue

AMID GROWING CONTROVERSY over the future of high-speed rail in California, the Center for Environmental Public Policy (CEPP), hosted the international conference, Realizing the Vision of a High-Speed Rail System in California: Connecting People While Fostering Prosperity, Smart Growth and Sustainability in May of 2011. This forum addressed the intersection of public policy, transportation and urban planning from business, government and non-governmental sector perspectives.

While politicians in California and Washington DC hotly debate high-speed rail, little attention has been given to the deeper issues at stake in California. This conference provided a non-partisan platform to examine the development of a high-speed rail system and the potential benefits for California. Experts from around the globe and across the nation met for the two-day conference to discuss the potential impact of California’s planned high-speed rail project on transportation policy, smart growth and local economic development. The event was co-chaired by the Goldman School’s CEPP Director Blas Pérez Henríquez and Elizabeth Deakin, Professor of City and Regional Planning and Urban Design.

The conference featured keynote speeches from former Congressman James L. Oberstar and world-renowned urban planner and innovator Peter Calthorpe, who talked about the need for California and the nation to commit to high-speed rail. “If America is going to thrive economically and compete in a 21st Century global marketplace, we will need a robust national transportation system, and that system must include high-speed rail,” he said. Calthorpe emphasized the benefits of a more sustainable, transit-oriented future for California — one that is anchored by a statewide High Speed Rail network.

High-speed rail would have the potential to become the green solution that meets California’s inter-city mobility need. But its implementation must be cost-effective and maximize the potential economic and environmental benefits for California.

The six conference panel sessions included leading policy, transportation and urban development thinkers such as Denis Deoutte of SNCF America, Albrecht Engel of AMTRAK, Roelof Van Ark of the California High Speed Rail Authority, and Sean Randolph of the Bay Area Council. Among the speakers and moderators from UC Berkeley were Samer Madanat, Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies and Michael O’Hare and John Quigley of the Goldman School. For a complete list of participants, visit CEPP’s website. CEPP’s academic partner for this project was the Berkeley Institute of Urban and Regional Development (IURD). External co-sponsors were the San Francisco Planning and Urban Planning Research Association (SPUR) and TransForm which is led by GSPP Alumnus Stuart Cohen (MPP ’97).

This event was possible thanks to the generous financial support of SNCF America, a subsidiary of the French National Railway Corporation.

For more information about the conference and to find out more about the CEPP Fall 2011 Seminar Series, please visit http://gspp.berkeley.edu/programs/cepp.html.

Policy Notes is published twice a year by UC Berkeley’s Goldman School of Public Policy. Send questions or comments to Bora Reed, 510.642.7591, borareed@berkeley.edu
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Executive and International Programs

By Blas Pérez Henriquez and Gan, Bai

The Goldman School’s Executive and International Programs had a busy summer hosting four groups of visitors who came to Berkeley from all over the world. On May 22, we kicked off the summer by welcoming 27 senior government officials from Taiwan. A week later, our second training program arrived from Kazakhstan. In mid-June, we hosted 23 senior police officials, representing 15 provinces of China. The annual Berkeley Executive Seminar concluded this productive summer during the last week of July, bringing together local government leaders from throughout California.

2011 Senior Civil Servants Training Program, Central Personnel Administration – Taiwan R.O.C

This training program marked the first successful collaboration between the Goldman School’s Executive and International Programs and the Central Personnel Administration of the government of Taiwan. The Taipei Economic and Cultural Office in San Francisco also played an important role in assisting the development of this relationship. The Taiwan delegation was headed by the Vice Minister of the Coast Guard, and many of the delegation’s 27 members were heads of a wide range of Taiwanese governmental agencies: the Directorate General of Highways, the Director of Taiwan’s Youth Commission, an Army General of the Veterans Affairs Directorate General of Highways, the Director of Taiwan’s Youth Commission, an Army General of the Veterans Affairs Commission, the Deputy Director-General of Taiwan’s Tourism Bureau, a Director of the Ministry of Education, the Vice Superintendent of Schools, and heads of a wide range of governmental agencies in Taiwan.

The Goldman School’s Executive and International Programs

Backed by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the Goldman School offered a Bailey week of July, bringing together local government leaders from throughout California. On May 22, we kicked off the summer by welcoming 27 senior government officials from Taiwan. A week later, our second program arrived from Kazakhstan. In mid-June, we hosted 23 senior police officials representing 15 provinces of China. The annual Berkeley Executive Seminar concluded this productive summer during the last week of July, bringing together local government leaders from throughout California.

2011 Senior Civil Servants Training Program, Central Personnel Administration – Taiwan R.O.C

Policy Analysis and Public Management Leadership Development

This program was the second of its kind, following the successful 2010 collaboration between the Goldman School and the government of Kazakhstan. Eight Master of Law students from Kazakhstan came to GSPP to study American political institutions, legal systems and other specific legal fields including financial law, land and property law, environmental regulation and criminal justice. The curriculum was designed by Prof. Sean Farhang with additional instruction from GSPP faculty and students. This program was the second of its kind, following the successful 2010 collaboration between the Goldman School and the government of Kazakhstan. Eight Master of Law students from Kazakhstan came to GSPP to study American political institutions, legal systems and other specific legal fields including financial law, land and property law, environmental regulation and criminal justice. The curriculum was designed by Prof. Sean Farhang with additional instruction from GSPP faculty and students. This program was the second of its kind, following the successful 2010 collaboration between the Goldman School and the government of Kazakhstan. Eight Master of Law students from Kazakhstan came to GSPP to study American political institutions, legal systems and other specific legal fields including financial law, land and property law, environmental regulation and criminal justice. The curriculum was designed by Prof. Sean Farhang with additional instruction from GSPP faculty and students. This program was the second of its kind, following the successful 2010 collaboration between the Goldman School and the government of Kazakhstan. Eight Master of Law students from Kazakhstan came to GSPP to study American political institutions, legal systems and other specific legal fields including financial law, land and property law, environmental regulation and criminal justice. The curriculum was designed by Prof. Sean Farhang with additional instruction from GSPP faculty and students. This program was the second of its kind, following the successful 2010 collaboration between the Goldman School and the government of Kazakhstan. Eight Master of Law students from Kazakhstan came to GSPP to study American political institutions, legal systems and other specific legal fields including financial law, land and property law, environmental regulation and criminal justice. The curriculum was designed by Prof. Sean Farhang with additional instruction from GSPP faculty and students. This program was the second of its kind, following the successful 2010 collaboration between the Goldman School and the government of Kazakhstan. Eight Master of Law students from Kazakhstan came to GSPP to study American political institutions, legal systems and other specific legal fields including financial law, land and property law, environmental regulation and criminal justice. The curriculum was designed by Prof. Sean Farhang with additional instruction from GSPP faculty and students.
GET INVOLVED WITH GSPP

HIRE Students
Post jobs, internships, or policy projects on goldJOBS, GSPP's on-line job posting system. http://gsppjobs.net

MENTOR Students
Volunteer to mentor a GSPP student by providing advice on career and academic choices. http://gspp.berkeley.edu/alumni/mentors.html

ENGAGE with GSPP Student Groups
Student groups range in substance including Students of Color, Environment, International, Women, LGBT, and Youth. http://gspp.berkeley.edu/students/index.html

CONTRIBUTE to PolicyMatters
To achieve its full potential, PolicyMatters needs alumni input through submitting articles, responses or online discussion. http://www.policymatters.net/

UPDATE Contact Information
Visit GSPP's website to update your alumni directory information and reconnect with fellow alumni. http://gspp.berkeley.edu/alumni/update_address.php

CONNECT to GSPP!
Find us on Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn.

Dean's Message Cont’d. from p. 2

If we can get social policy right, then we can improve America’s competitiveness, create more jobs, solve our budgetary problems, and care for the elderly, the needy, and the young. The Goldman School is contributing in many ways to meet this challenge. At the same time, the School has always imbued in its students a healthy skepticism about the limits of governmental action, and it is fitting that our graduate Michael Genest, former head of California’s Department of Finance, reminds us in his editorial, “Why I am Not a Progressive” about the limits of social policy and governmental action.

Henry E. Brady
Dean, Goldman School of Public Policy
Class of 1941 Monroe Deutsch Professor of Political Science and Public Policy