



Waiting with a warm welcome is the staff and administration of the recently completed University of Missouri-Columbia Eldercare Center. The goal of the center is to provide an alternative to nursing home care for elderly who need supervision and care or for those who want to spend their free time with those their age. The center, the second one in the University System, will be ready for the arrival of participants in late January. For a modest fee, friends and relatives can know their elderly companions are receiving constant care and enjoying many activities. Ready and waiting are Lois Long (left), director of the center, Rose Mary Langland, gerontological clinical nurse specialist, and Richard Oliver, director of the UMC School of Health Related Professions. Read more about the Eldercare Center inside on page 2. Photo by Pat Nichols.

Gov. Ashcroft names two new curators, reappoints a third.
Page 1.

Ad hoc benefits committee named.
Page 1.

Meet the curators. Sixth in the series.
Page 2.

In This Issue:

The Agenda for Action: Setting it straight

Editor's note: In a further effort to clarify for the members of the UM Board of Curators and the University System community at large the components of the Agenda for Action and the process for its completion, UM System President C. Peter Magrath made the following remarks at the January meeting of the board:

It is too important to emphasize that the Agenda for Action consists of two parts, repairing the base and selected program improvements.

With respect to the first part, repairing the base, the board has approved the five-year financial plan calling for \$102 million to meet our compensation requirements and to improve our libraries, academic computing, equipment replacement and preservation of facilities. However, we are in quite another position with respect to the program improvements.

In both the fiscal year 1990 appropriations request and in the financial plan approved by the board in December, this part of the Agenda for Action was approved with the recognition that neither the total projected cost of \$40 million nor the specific candidates for program improvements were firm. It is, however, important to note that a process is under way to complete this part of the agenda. We are still

operating within that process, and, as you know, a working draft of the University Planning Council's report has been distributed to each campus for review. I have asked for these reviews to be completed by the

It is important to emphasize that the Agenda for Action consists of two parts — repairing the base and selected program improvements.

campuses no later than April 3, and I have specifically asked the campuses to provide a *general* plan for campus

academic program improvements for the next five years and *specific* program improvements for inclusion in the fiscal year 1991 state appropriations request.

In budget meetings on each of the University campuses I have stressed the importance of broad participation by the faculty and the University System community in these discussions.

I want to stress with the greatest emphasis that the report of the University Planning Council which was distributed to the campuses in December is *not* the Agenda for Action; rather, it is an internal working document that will help us shape the Agenda as it will be presented to the board following campus recommendations and discussion among the general officers. It is important again to separate the University Planning Council working draft from the Agenda for Action and its two major components, repairing the base and selected program improvements.

Through the broad participation of viewpoints in the campus reviews of the planning council's working draft and in response to the request for general and specific program priorities for the fiscal year 1991 budget request, we have created a process to ensure campus communication and systemwide communication on these important issues.

This process is positive, it is democratic and it is intended to provide an opportunity for the University System to put its best foot forward.

I want to stress that the report of the University Planning Council is *not* the Agenda for Action; rather it is an internal working document that will help us shape the Agenda as it will be presented to the board.

Ashcroft names two new curators, reappoints John Lichtenegger

Gov. John Ashcroft has appointed two new members to the UM System Board of Curators and reappointed a third.

John Lichtenegger of Jackson has been reappointed to the board for a term ending in 1995. Lichtenegger was first appointed in 1985 to complete the term of Charles Kruse, who resigned from the board to become the state's director of agriculture.

The two new curators are Carrie Francke of Columbia, who replaces Jeanne Epple, and Webb Gilmore of Kansas City, who replaces W.H. "Bert" Bates. Both Francke and Gilmore will serve until 1995. All three appointees have received Senate confirmation.

Francke, who holds three degrees from UM-Columbia, is a partner in the law firm of Powell, Seitz and Francke. She is also an adjunct professor of law at Columbia College.

Francke holds a bachelor's degree in political science and one in journalism. She received her juris doctor degree from the UMC School of Law in 1981. She then received a master's degree in public administration in 1984. She also attended the American University in Washington, D.C., for a year, graduating with distinction. While a student at UMC, Francke was the first woman to be elected president of the Missouri Students Association.

From November 1982 to June 1984 and November 1984 to October 1986, Francke served as assistant attorney general in Missouri. She was a candidate for the U.S. Congress from the 9th District in 1984 and a candidate for the Republican primary for Congress in 1986.

Francke is a member of the Boone County Bar Association, the Missouri Bar Association, the American Bar

Association, the American Trial Lawyers Association and the American Political Science Association. She is active in the University of Missouri-Columbia Alumni Association and is a member of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce.

In 1985, Francke was appointed by President Reagan to be the U.S. delegate to the United Nations Conference on Women in Nairobi, Kenya.

Gilmore is a partner in the firm of Gilmore and Bell. He received his juris doctor degree from the UMC School of Law in 1973. There he was a member of the Missouri Law Review, the recipient of the Trial Practice Award and a member of the board of governors for the Student Bar Association.

He received a bachelor's degree in mathematics from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1966. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1966 to 1970 as a lieutenant in the nuclear submarine force.

Gilmore was admitted to the Missouri Supreme Court in 1973 and is a member of the Missouri Bar Association, the American Bar Association, the Lawyers Association of Kansas City, the Kansas City Bar Association and the National Association of Bond Lawyers.

Lichtenegger is a 1972 graduate of the UMC School of Law and is a partner in the firm of Lichtenegger and Ellis. He is a member of the Missouri Bar Association, the American Bar Association, the Missouri Municipal Attorneys Association and was admitted to the Supreme Court of the United States Bar in 1976.

Lichtenegger served as vice president of the Board of Curators in 1988. He also served as chairman of the Long-Range Planning Committee.

Work of employee benefits committee begins

An ad hoc faculty and staff benefits planning committee has been named to provide UM System President C. Peter Magrath with a comprehensive assessment of the University's current programs and plans for program changes.

The specific charge to the committee:

1. Develop a statement of the objectives of the University's benefit programs. An assessment of the current benefit plans relative to the objectives should be included. Consideration should be given to the University's compensation policy, relating to indirect compensation (employee benefits) vis a vis direct compensation (salary and wages).
2. Develop general principles for the plans such as (a) the relationship between employer and employee contributions; (b) the extent to which income replacement plans should meet income needs; (c) the integration with legally mandated benefits to the maximum extent possible; and (d) compliance with legal requirements.
3. Propose goals for specific benefit plans.
4. Propose protocol to measure the success of programs in satisfying the goals established.

Associate Vice President for Human Resource Services Ken Hutchinson will serve as staff director to the committee. The committee is to report no later than May 15. It will make periodic reports to UM Vice President for Administrative Affairs Jim McGill.

Members of the committee: Mark Burkholder (chairman), UM-St. Louis professor of history; Edith Mitchell, UM-Columbia assistant professor of medicine; Ronald A. Ratti, UMC professor of economics; Keith Schrader, UMC professor of mathematics; Myrna Bruning, assistant director, professional services, UMC Hospital and Clinics; Robert Downs, UM-Kansas City associate professor of law; Mary Jo Grimm, UMKC senior educational team assistant; Donald B. Hatch, director, physical plant; Chris Hoyt, UMKC associate professor of law; Ralph W. Alexander Jr., UM-Rolla professor of physics; Phyllis A. McCoy, assistant director, personnel, UMR; Donald D. Myers, director of research services, UMR; Margaret A. Richardson, supervisor, payroll, UMR; Robert S. Stich, UMSL professor of business administration; Costa G. Haddad, assistant to the UMSL dean of arts and sciences; Michele Hoyman, UMSL associate professor of political science; Nancy Marlin, UM System assistant vice president for academic affairs; and Vivian Mason, administrative assistant, University Extension.

In addition to Hutchinson, Mike Paden, director, UM employee benefits, will serve as staff to the committee. The committee will be assisted by an outside consulting firm specializing in employee benefits—Tower, Perrin, Forster and Crosby.

Employees are encouraged to direct any questions or concerns they would like the committee to consider to a committee member.

Peter H. Raven

Curator Peter Raven's concern for the University of Missouri System and the state of Missouri does not stem from personal ties to Missouri education.

In that respect, he is different from the other eight curators.

He received his education at the University of California.

Why serve as a curator?

"For one thing, it's a very interesting way to learn more about the state," Raven, who has been director of the Missouri Botanical Garden in St. Louis since 1971, says. "After all, I have spent most of my life around universities and especially land-grant universities. I'm very interested in them and what they mean. I'm enthusiastic about the opportunity to serve."

Other than that?

"My mother's family passed through the state on its way west in 1846, and the University was there," Raven adds with a smile.

He acknowledges that each board member makes a specific contribution to the board and that it works best if it's largely a lay board.

"There isn't any particular expertise needed to serve on the board," Raven says. "I think the people who are serving are dedicated individuals with varying backgrounds, and it adds up to a good mix. I'm not sure it would be desirable to have everyone on the board deeply involved in academic issues at the University of Missouri, for example. After all, we have to represent the people of the state. The more representative we are, the better."

"Perhaps it's a mild advantage not to have any particular connection with any particular campus in the UM System. But there certainly is no one on the board whom I would consider as being partisan to one campus. We all look at the University as a system."

Raven's experience in the university setting has been vast and varied. He serves as the Engelmann Professor of Botany at Washington University in St. Louis and as an adjunct professor of biology at St. Louis University and UM-St. Louis. He was an associate professor at Stanford University from 1962 to 1971.

Raven admits his interest in biology and the natural sciences makes him aware of the challenges of training in those sciences for students of the University System. He feels biology is the field that will play a central role in determining the relative strengths of universities in the future.



Photos by Pat Nibbelk

"Therefore, any self-respecting research university has got to be quite involved with biology because biology is the equivalent of sustainability," Raven says. "If you learn how to use biological systems, you can produce things. That is why I have encouraged the development of biology programs on all of the campuses. I see many connections between biology and engineering, biology and the physical sciences, biology and the social

sciences.

"That is one of the reasons I would personally never subscribe to the idea that the University, while it's trying to improve its financial position, should never take on new initiatives. You must take initiatives to survive and flourish in the future, and I believe that applies, for example, to the many opportunities in biology."

Raven's birth in Shanghai, China, foretold his international orientation.

"I think people in the Midwest need as much opportunity for international outlook as they can get," Raven says. "The intensification of the greenhouse effect, the acid rain, the depletion of the ozone layer and the extinction of plants and animals all over the world are bringing people to realize we have a stake in the global environment, and the way that environment is changing will have an effect on every single graduate of this university. We need to be concerned about how we are educating them for this, and that transcends many of the traditional methods of education. We need to understand the global situation better than has been customary. So perhaps I can help by bringing a more international perspective to bear on problems that come to the board."



While Raven feels an emphasis on the sciences is important in a university curriculum, he believes strongly that schools must maintain a balance and capture the essence of the land-grant university, which Raven defines as having a broad spectrum of programs and providing a variety of services to the state.

That belief pertains also to research for Raven. There is room for research in all areas. The question, he says, should not be whether a certain field is appropriate for research, but whether the research being conducted is being conducted well.

Raven sees one of the most challenging roles of being curator as the need to relate individually, socially and politically with other members of the board.

"That is a continual and positive challenge," he says. "It's too small a body politic to function any other way, and that requires quite a bit of energy. A difficulty may arise when you believe passionately in something. How do you present your point of view clearly, but in a way that does not offend other people who believe something else is true? Yet you must maintain your integrity and point of view. That takes a great deal of energy and thought."

As is the case for many curators, the discussions and decisions surrounding divestment were a challenge for Raven. Curators are charged with

protecting the financial resources of the University System. Some of the largest firms have very small operations in South Africa. For instance, Raven says, American Express has only 20 employees in South Africa — 20,000 in the rest of the world.

On another level, Raven wonders whether divestment will improve the situation in South Africa. He believes more interaction with South Africa and its educational institutions is a positive response. Yet he realizes that for many people in the state and in the University System divestment is a highly emotional and symbolic issue. Since the Board of Curators is charged with representing the people of the state, Raven says the ultimate decision was well taken.

"As I worked my way through that decision, I realized it was very difficult on many different levels," Raven says, "and it was the kind of issue that leads well-meaning and hard-thinking people to be irritated with one another. There are many ways of looking at it."

The concern over employee salaries is an important issue for Raven and the board as a whole. It is a genuine challenge for the administration. Yet, Raven feels that the UM System is being led by outstanding individuals with tremendous dedication.

"It is a splendid accomplishment for a university president to hire and retain such outstanding people as Jim McGill, George Russell, Martin Jischke, Marguerite Barnett and Haskell Monroe," Raven says. "That is the mark of a really excellent president and the best way to ensure a strong future for the University. If you are weak and incompetent yourself, you couldn't possibly attract such first-class, strong people. I don't think the University of Missouri System gives anything away to anybody, although that may seem to be a surprising observation in the middle of all our talk about how bad the situation is."

"If resources are scarce, everyone feels bad. I've been told that I need to understand Missouri is a low-tax, low-service state and people like it that way. I don't believe that is the case because the lack of resources only leads to frustration. Many university faculties are dissatisfied, even those that are paid higher salaries than University of Missouri employees."

"Income tax isn't a very old development in Missouri and there just isn't much of a mechanism for generating money. Someone has got to take some leadership in this, but no one wants to be pinned down for being responsible for raising taxes."

Raven feels the University System needs to communicate we need trained and skilled people in the state in large numbers and most of them need to be produced through public education in the state. If people don't invest in higher education, Raven says, Missouri will suffer a tremendous erosion in the state's economic base. If Missouri really wants to capitalize on industrial and other growth in the future, it's going to have to put money and effort into preparing the workers of tomorrow.

"I want this state to be competitive and to flourish — not just to be average or above average," Raven says. "Arguing whether the state is 27th or 45th is really splitting hairs. What is needed is a more positive attitude."

"You don't hear many people say, 'Let's really make the University of Missouri something good.' You hear people say, 'Do we quite come up to average or not?' I mean, people don't sit around in their lives and say, 'I wish I could come up to average.' You may know the saying, 'He's on the escalator of life, headed for the mezzanine.' We don't want the University to be that way."

"Peter Magrath, as chief administrative officer of the University, needs to be the quarterback. We need signals, and we need direction. I don't think the faculty or staff or even the curators can really rip the balance."

Unlike some others, Raven does not believe the University of Missouri System is trying to do too many things. State universities, he says, ought to provide all the kinds of majors and specializations important to the state. As a public land-grant institution, the UM System is not free to favor certain specializations over others.

Peter H. Raven

Director, Missouri Botanical Garden, 1971-present
John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation Fellow, 1985-89
U.S. National Academy of Sciences, 1977-present
Governor Board, National Research Council, 1983-1986
Fellow, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, 1977-present
Foreign Member, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences, 1982-present
Honorary Member, Royal Society of New Zealand, 1984-present
Fellow, American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1980-present
Honorary Doctor of Science degree from St. Louis University, 1982
Honorary Doctor of Science degree at University of Miami (Ohio), 1986
International Environmental Leadership Medal, United Nations Environmental Programme, 1982
Honorary President, III National Congress of Botany, Iquitos, Peru, 1985
President, American Society of Naturalists, 1983
President, American Institute of Biological Sciences, 1983-1984
Editorial Board Darwiniana, 1985-present
Editorial Board of Directors, Diversity, 1985-present
International Advisory Committee, The Nature Conservancy, 1985-present
National Academy of Sciences, Council Committee on Membership Affairs, 1985-present
Keynote speaker at First International Prize in Biology Symposium in Japan, 1985

"We need to keep in mind the many needs of the state," Raven adds. "Washington University doesn't have to do that. Princeton doesn't have to keep in mind all the needs in New Jersey. Stanford doesn't have to keep in mind all the needs in California. They can specialize in whatever they choose. To some extent we are constrained in doing that because of who we are."

In addressing employees, Raven says he would tell them improvement of salaries is the top priority of the administration and the Board of Curators. It has always been a top priority and will continue to be. However, Raven is not willing to go as far as to say that any but a very few programs should be de-emphasized or removed to provide those funds. In the long run, he says, that would leave the University System crippled.

"I think it's generally agreed the best kind of salary set up is one in which there is a regular progression of ranks," Raven says. "People who stay in the ranks will be well-paid. You need to judge people on what they contribute, and they all contribute in different ways."

"I truly wish we could stop thinking about being average and think about how we can really do well. We need to forget the Big Eight, except to compete with them. In other words, we often use salary levels not as a measure of how competitive we are, but rather as a measure of how bad it is, which leaves all of us sitting around wringing our hands. If you said it another way, such as 'If we put more money in there, we'll be able to recruit more faculty and staff and provide better opportunities,' it sounds

(Continued on page 3.)

A call for better university communication

by James Doyle

UMSL
Professor of Philosophy

Chairing the Intercampus Faculty Council this year has given me a perspective on problems of communication that I would like to share with the University community. I am speaking particularly of problems of communication among faculty, staff and administrators at the system as well as the campus level. These problems are not new to the University, but they have become more acute because of the relentless erosion of faculty and staff compensation, and academic and research services, that has now reached crisis proportions.

Fortunately, the effect of this crisis has not been entirely negative. It has provoked conscientious efforts by President Magrath and his staff, other administrators, many faculty and staff members and the Board of Curators to improve communication among these key segments of the University. One notable example was the face-to-face meeting of the IFC and chairs of campus governing bodies with the board and general officers in December. Another was the president's personal letter to all faculty and staff just before

the holiday, encouraging us to respond with ideas, suggestions and reactions.

Despite these and many other efforts, serious problems of communication remain. Communication among faculty, staff and administrators tends to involve the exchange of more information than most of us know what to do with and less knowledge than we need in order to be able to work together effectively. We live in a time dominated by information, often to the neglect of knowledge, which is information transformed into judgment, feeling, conviction, insight and shared meaning. To be effective, at least in a university, communication must also involve discourse, dialogue and conversation. All too often, our conversation with one another is not only one-sided, but coded to maintain a safe distance between us.

As a result of these problems of communication, most of us — faculty, staff and administrators alike — experience more remoteness, insensitivity, misunderstanding, distrust, skepticism and resentment than we would like. This inhibits the kinds of social interaction necessary to maintain a climate of intellectual excitement in teaching and research, academic freedom and autonomy, variety and flexibility of work and collegiality and

effective governance. According to a recent survey by the American Association of University Professors, this favorable social climate is more important than compensation and job security in determining the attractiveness and satisfaction of work in universities — assuming, of course, that compensation and job security are adequate and competitive. Such a climate is closely correlated with the quality of learning, scholarship, research and public service.

The size, diversity and complexity of the University make this favorable climate difficult to maintain even in the best of circumstances. The University's severe budgetary crisis makes this all the more difficult, if not impossible. By dramatizing our problems of communication, however, the current crisis may at least help us identify these problems and work together to solve them. We might well begin with problems in sharing responsibility for decisions about University priorities and budgets, salary policies and their implementation, assessment and accountability of academic programs, computing and library resources, improvement and addition of programs and other issues that significantly affect the University's academic and research climate.

By adopting more conversational and collegial forms of communication, as the IFC is often able to do in its interaction with President Magrath and his administrative staff, we can help maintain a climate in which excellent teaching and research can flourish. This will not only strengthen the University's claim to a higher level of public and private support. It will also make teaching, research and public service more attractive to our most talented students.

In the spirit of the kind of communication I have advocated, I encourage you, the reader, to join this conversation about problems of communication and what we can do about them, either in the pages of *Spectrum* or elsewhere.

We welcome submissions for "Commentary" from faculty and staff. Please send your contribution to *Spectrum*, 823 Lewis Hall, Columbia.

Employees can look forward to increases, back pay

UM System employees will receive a bonus Feb. 15 when checks for back pay based on new salary increases are distributed.

Employees will see the increases reflected in their paychecks at the end of February.

The increases are made possible by Gov. Ashcroft's release of 50 percent of withheld funds to the University System. Approximately \$3.9 million has been made available for salary increases. The funds will provide an additional average salary increase of 1.5 percent for current faculty and staff eligible for increases Sept. 1.

Ken Hutchinson, UM System associate vice president for human resource services, says all of the released money will go to salaries and wages and to salary-based benefit programs such as Social Security and retirement.

Hutchinson says the amounts allocated to the campuses will equal 1.5 percent of the state component of each campus's general operating budget.

"Salary increases will be adjusted from Sept. 1 for exempt employees and Aug. 21 for non-exempt employees," Hutchinson says. "New salaries will be based on the guidelines for salary and wage increases approved by the Board of Curators. Those provisions are based on market and merit."

Employees hired since Sept. 1 will not be eligible for increases.

Employees will receive their back pay through the same payroll procedure in which they are enrolled currently. For instance, if an employee uses direct deposit, the check for back pay will be deposited directly on Feb. 15.

Imig to serve as liaison with state agencies

In order to improve the ties between the UM System and its capabilities and state government, Gail Imig, UM System associate vice president for academic affairs-University Extension, will serve as contact person for the UM System, announces UM System President C. Peter Magrath. Imig will channel or direct requests for cooperation or information to the appropriate University System department or state agency.



Imig

The need for a University contact person stems from discussions Magrath and other University officials have had with state agency directors in recent weeks.

"It goes without saying there are countless and excellent working relationships between state government and this four-campus statewide University. In many cases state officials are familiar with the University's operations and procedures and know how to move ahead with contacts and inquiries. There are, however, gaps on both sides, and we are all anxious to strengthen the collaboration between the University and state government," Magrath said in a letter to the state agency heads.

"Gail Imig is ideally situated for this role because of her knowledge of the University through her leadership position in our statewide extension programs," Magrath continued.

Her role is not to serve as a censor or screen who must be contacted, but to serve as a facilitator if and when an agency director needs University assistance, Magrath said. When University people need to know which state agency to approach for help or a possible collaborative venture, Imig will assist them by contacting a state agency.

Wallace, Strickland take interim posts

Richard Wallace, associate vice president for academic affairs, has been named to serve as interim vice president for academic affairs following the retirement of Jay Barton Dec. 31.

In turn, Wallace has named Arvarh Strickland as interim associate vice president for academic affairs.

This is the second time Wallace has served as interim vice president, having served in that capacity from July to December 1984. When Barton was named vice president for academic affairs, Wallace filled the associate vice president slot. Prior to joining University System administration,

Wallace was a professor of economics and an administrator at UM-Columbia.

"Arvarh will assume even more of the workload for the office in the months ahead, and I particularly look forward to his support and involvement in academic planning and evaluation of academic programs," Wallace says.

Strickland has been senior faculty associate in the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs since 1987. He came to the University System administration from the UMC Department of History where he was a professor and one-time department chairman.

Raven

(Continued from page 2.)

completely different."

Raven feels it's important for faculty and staff to know the curators so they won't appear to be some "mysterious sort of alien body." Raven adds people sometimes perceive the board having a much more hidden and sinister agenda than it really has. But there is no deeper policy. In fact, board policy is what you hear being discussed. In private sessions, Raven says, the board primarily discusses selling and buying real estate and hiring major University officers. He adds, "It really can be incredibly boring."



Raven's office at the botanical garden adjoins a lab he shares with students. He often goes from one meeting to another. He is highly sought after for committee work, service to organizations, teaching assignments and as an author.

How does he get it all done?

"I wouldn't say I'm an extremely organized individual, but I am efficient in the use of my time," Raven says. "I can get the essence of something fairly quickly."

When not answering calls to duty, Raven and his wife, Tamra, who is also a biologist, enjoy collecting plants, swimming and vacationing. The family loves to travel, and Raven often takes them with him on business trips.

And Raven admits being a member of the Board of Curators is a break in his daily routine.

"I enjoy it precisely because it is different, and it puts me in touch with different kinds of people. And I enjoy the closeness and friendship among members of the board," Raven says. "It's just not true that all we talk about is University policy and other formal matters. We all have multiple relationships with each other, but I think it's true to say we all like each other very much. It's a close relationship — really special."

New eldercare center opens doors and opportunities for the elderly

by Sharon Reid

University Relations

Adult day-care centers are just one way the University of Missouri System is dealing with the concerns of the growing elderly population.

Adult day care provides health and social services for frail or impaired adults who cannot be left alone but do not need the full facilities of a nursing home.

The UM-Columbia School of Health Related Professions will operate the first licensed adult day-care center in the Columbia area. The center, called Eldercare Center, opens Jan. 31.

A part of the UMC Clark Hall lobby has been renovated to accommodate the center. The 3,000-square-foot area includes a private entrance, reception and relaxation areas, dining and serving facilities, a quiet room and restrooms.

The UM-St. Louis Eldercare Center, administered through UMSL Continuing Education-Extension, has been open since July 1985.

The centers offer nursing supervision and social services, planned educational experiences and recreational activities, access to rehabilitation services, nutritious hot lunches and snacks.

Activities range from music programs, planned exercise and self-help seminars to field trips.

"Some neat things have been worked out with community groups," Lois Long, director of the UMC center, says. "An important group is

youngsters. Most adult day-care centers have an arrangement of some kind with elementary and pre-school children."

Adult day-care centers can help elderly financially. While the UMC Eldercare Center fee is \$30 a day, the Columbia area nursing homes average \$57 a day. Medicaid will help defray the cost since the Eldercare Center qualifies as a Medicaid provider.

Adult day care does not replace nursing homes. Instead, it provides another alternative. "Our goal is to provide care for frail adults who really don't need the 24-hour services in a nursing home," Long says.

Often an elderly person can continue to live with the family instead of moving to a nursing home. "As people age and their fears increase about their potential illnesses, they tend to want to stay at home more," Long says.

Another benefit of adult day care is respite. The family undergoes a lot of stress when taking care of the elderly person who cannot stay alone. "I think relief from this constant care is critical," Long says.

The new UMC Eldercare Center provides the school a chance to upgrade its teaching, research and service mission. The self-supporting centers serve a community need while acting as a resource to other day-care programs.

For more information about the center, write to Lois Long, Director, UMC Eldercare Center, 200 Clark Hall, UMC, Columbia, 65211, or call

(314) 882-7070. People interested in the center in St. Louis should call Marilyn McGuire at (314) 524-0155.

About the elderly

● 13.7 percent of Missourians are aged 65 or older, reports the U.S. Census Bureau.

● The number of elderly is expected to double between 1980 and 2000, says the U.S. Census Bureau.

● Of people over 65, the most rapidly growing group consists of people over 80, says the U.S. Census Bureau.

● Elderly have 30 percent to 50 percent chance of spending some time in a nursing home before they die, reports a June 30, 1988, Wall Street Journal article.

● Nursing homes nationwide cost an average \$22,000 a year, reports the Brookings Institution.

● 70 percent of all single people admitted to a nursing home are broke within three months, reports the Wall Street Journal.

● 50 percent of all couples with one spouse admitted to a nursing home are broke within six months, reports the Wall Street Journal.

● There are more than 1,200 adult day-care centers nationwide.

● Missouri has licensed 22 centers, most in Kansas City and St. Louis.

SYSTEM ADMINISTRATION
TURNER, RONALD JOE
PRESIDENT'S OFFICE
321 UNIVERSITY HALL

SPECTRUM

is published monthly by UM University Relations, 828 Lewis Hall, Columbia, in cooperation with the Columbia, Kansas City, Rolla and St. Louis information offices.

Editor: Mary Paulsell
Phone: (314) 882-0607

