

UCI EMERITAE/I NEWS

VOL. 2, NO. 4

Nov. 1995

NOBEL LAUREATES SHERWOOD ROWLAND AND FRED REINES

With the announcement that two UCI Professors have been awarded 1995 Nobel Prizes, this is a proud moment for all Emeritae/i. Professor Sherwood Rowland received the Chemistry Award for his outstanding contribution to the understanding of the ozone depletion from the stratosphere and its threat to human survival. Just last year, Sherry addressed an Emeritae/i Association luncheon on his professional activities.

We also honor Fred Reines, recipient of the Nobel Prize in Physics for discovering the neutrino, a subatomic particle he found, working at Los Alamos in the 1950s.

We understand that Dr. Reines is not now well, but hope he will be able to attend the formal Swedish Nobel Celebration.

ONE WAY OF BEING A GOOD COLLEAGUE

Renee Riese Hubert

My husband and I finished our Ph.D.s within the same week in the same department at Columbia University, in the Spring of 1951. For obvious reasons, we were considered somewhat questionable at the time, even though Eisenhower presided over our university. I was therefore interested in looking for academic support among partners who had the (mis)fortune of operating in the same field. The best known turned out to be a Berkeley couple, Yakov Malkiel, a famous Romance philologist, and Rosa Maria Lida de Malkiel, a no less gifted literary scholar, who had been compelled to give up her professorship because the University of California (as well as many others) strictly enforced antinepotism rules. I was advised by colleagues and administrators not to stand in my husband's way by seeking a teaching position. Fortunately, even in the early fifties, my spouse believed in "equal opportunity."

Until the sixties, we muddled through, when somewhat suddenly we received four joint offers in three years. The laws of supply and demand explained this shift. Exceptions to the antinepotism rule were requested and granted. After two years at the University of Illinois, we were appointed at Irvine in 1967 once again as full professors in the same department. UCI engineered two sweeping exceptions at the same moment: two appointments in the same department, one a woman full professor.

We did not long remain the only tenured couple. But no more exceptions had to be made, since the rule, with its discriminatory implications, had been abolished. Today, the School of Humanities alone can boast of some six couples, and we are gratified that we did not spoil the show for any of them. We are convinced that each person has been evaluated on her or his own merits and is treated accordingly.

(Continued on page 2)

IN MEMORIAM

With sadness the Editorial Board notes the recent death of Eleanor (Ellie) Fagin, wife of Henry Fagin, our editor. Ellie was known to many emeritae/i and was a frequent attendee at our lunches. A professional artist, she painted both in acrylic and watercolor.

She was a woman of great creativity, individuality, and sensitivity. She was both a strong feminist and nonconformist especially sensitive to social injustice. We express our heartfelt condolences to Henry and their children who have suffered an irreparable loss.

ETHICS AT UCI

Jerome S. Tobis

One of the year's tragic events has been the notoriety and scandal associated with the Center for Reproductive Health at the UCI Medical Center. The program had attained international prominence for its technological advances as well as achievements in enabling many couples who sought help in having infants to become parents. In the framework of such worthy endeavors, the allegations are particularly painful: e. g. appropriating eggs without consent, the use of unapproved drugs and doctors taking funds that belonged to the university. But, judgment concerning the accusations should be withheld because the doctors deny any wrongdoing, and they should have the opportunity to defend themselves before a court of law.

Rather, I turn the searchlight on the hospital administration and the medical staff, who knew of the alleged unethical behaviors for the past several years and never invited the Hospital Ethics Committee to look into the situation. This committee's very purpose is to ensure that any individual within the hospital community--patient or family or staff member--may have an ethical issue addressed and if appropriate redressed. Moreover, the committee is charged with exposing and attempting to change unethical institutional policies and pertinent societal ones as well.

In the fierce courtroom of the daily newspapers, many university executives of integrity are being castigated, accused of cover-ups, and unfairly attacked for a multitude of alleged sins. In retrospect, much of the mudslinging which already has done considerable harm to our university could have been diminished if not avoided had the authorities used the resource that exists for just such a purpose: the Hospital Ethics Committee.

Finally, one admonition about withholding judgment: Whatever the charges (even perhaps proven) against particular individuals, there is an underlying societal atmosphere in our health care system as well as in other areas of endeavor (e.g., the Savings and Loan debacle of a few years ago) that encourages greed, fraud, and their concomitants. As concerned members of the university community we should look also at the bigger picture.

UCI EMERITAE/I ASSOCIATION OFFICERS

Chair: Louis A. Gottschalk
Vice-Chair: Jerome S. Tobis
Treasurer: Sheen Kassouf
Recording Secretary: Kivie Moldave
Corresponding Secy.: Open
Past Chair: Renee Riese Hubert

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor: Henry Fagin
Editorial Board Chair: Jerome Tobis
Ex Officio: Louis A. Gottschalk
 David Easton Kivie Moldave

UCI EMERITAE/I NEWS is published by the
 Association about six times annually.

A GOOD COLLEAGUE

(Continued from page 1)

Judd and I had our separate fields of study, our different methodology, and our way of being tough or lenient with students. Neither one of us ever submitted a research paper or article without having taken into account the motivated criticism of the other. So we faced with equanimity many challenges: that of the partner, the colleagues, the profession, in addition to that of the changing role of women in the University which affected us both.

Since we became emeriti [sic] in 1987, we extended the territory of joint activities. We team taught a class in the English M.A. summer program. We carefully worked out a plan whereby neither one would take over and whereby embarrassing silences would not intrude thanks to the important role played by students in the discussions. The experiment was considered successful by us from the standpoint of partnership since students were convinced that throughout our careers we had invariably shared courses in the same class room. Also, since retirement we have collaborated more and more in our research.

We published a translation of a Dada novel and two articles under our double signature. In the first article, our roles remained distinct, as Judd dealt with verbal principles and interpretation, and I with their visual counterparts. In the second, we worked on the same material from the outset and went through all the stages together. Our old practice of turning the other into the critic of a work from rough draft to completion was no longer applicable. Now, we have decided to work on a booklength study together. The topic is the Artist Books (books made by artists, hence usually not mass

produced). I have worked in the relations of text and image for many years. At this stage, I am eager still to work with a collaborator, who brings the fruit of his own research in addition to great competence in my field, by accompanying me in a disinterested fashion to many libraries, collection, and galleries. So far, retirement has been fruitful for both of us: Renee has published two books, the first on surrealist illustration, the other, naturally, on partnership, and Judd, a French scholar, has published a book on Shakespeare and has completed a second one, forthcoming in 1997, on Corneille.

I cannot remember who gave me a well meant warning when we were on our way to Illinois: this double appointment would radically threaten our marital relations!

LETTERS-TO-THE-EDITOR:

We warmly welcome letters to the editor. Letters selected for publication will be those that give readers a fuller understanding of topics of common interest. Because space is limited, a letter should be no more than 500 words (two manuscript pages, typed double-space).

To the editor:

One of the charges and responsibilities of the Executive Committee of the Emeritae/i Association and of the Academic Senate Committee on Emeritae/i has been to preserve the rights and privileges of the Emeritae/i. There rights and privileges have been clarified and documented. The UCI Academic Senate, under the Chairmanship of Professor Jim Danzinger, has intended to distribute these emeritae/i rights and privileges to Deans and Department Chairs in order to facilitate their being recognized and honored by University Administration.

An unexpected erosion of these rights and privileges occurred in May, 1995 at a meeting of the University of California Academic Council, under Chair Dan Simmons, who ignored the recommendations of representatives of the Committee of Rules and Jurisdiction and Faculty Welfare. A revision of Senate Bylaw 55 occurred. This revision action denied emeritae/i "the privilege of notice of meeting on personnel actions, access to materials, privilege of the floor, and/or the privilege of making their opinions known to the voting members of the department unless it is explicitly extended to them by "at least a two-thirds majority vote by secret ballot of those faculty entitled to vote on the cases in question."

In my opinion this action was ill-advised and unfortunate. It came about through a misunderstanding of Senate Bylaw 55, according to R.L. Wild, at that time (1994-95) Chair of the University-wide Council of Emeritae/i Associations (CUCEA). When the revision was proposed it was not expected to pass, but Dan Simmons would hear no discussion of the matter, and it passed with no discussion.

This revision is expected to be challenged during the current academic year (1995-96), according to Philip Levine, CUCEA Information Officer and Robert Wild, CUCEA Past Chair. A process that might facilitate this move would be the establishment of an Academic Senate Committee on Emeritae/i on the two remaining UC campuses with none, so that the UC Academic Senate could then form a systemwide committee on Emeritae/i. Another approach, suggested by Professor Wild and especially the new CUCEA Chair Harold K. Ticho is for the emeritae/i leadership to lie low until after Dan Simmons retires from the Chairmanship of the UC Academic Senate.

UCI EMERITAE/I NEWS invites your opinions and suggestions regarding this important issue.

*Louis A. Gottschalk, Exec. Committee Chair,
 UCI Emeritae/i Association.*

MORE ABOUT RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES

On page 3 of this newsletter, we present excerpts from one UC department's innovative response to the present disputed legislation. To your Editor's mind, this seems a sensible proposal pending the resolution of a dispute that well may continue for months or even years into the future. The experience gained if the proposal is accepted should be valuable in any case.

Also, deserving rereading is an earlier broad article on the subject in *UCI EMERITAE/I NEWS* (Vol.2., No.2, Page 2, March 1995).

NEXT EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING :

Monday, Dec. 4, 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.

in our offices (545 Administration).

All Association members including spouses are encouraged to participate in these monthly meetings.

[name], Chair
Department of [name]

Dear [name]

We, the [department] [Emerit[ae/i], request that the Department ... take action in accordance with the recently revised Academic Senate Bylaw 55, Article D.1.b, to grant [Emeritae/i] Senate members "the privilege of notice of meeting on personnel actions, access to materials, and/or privilege of the floor."

May we review the background to this request? Regental Standing Order 105.1(a) states: "Membership in the Senate shall not lapse by virtue of transference to [emerita/us] status." Academic Senate Bylaw 55.D. further states: "Academic Senate members who have retired and transmitted to emeritus/a status retain departmental membership." Although emeriti/ae are specifically denied voting rights on personnel matters unless the department grants these rights by a two-thirds vote of active Senate members, Bylaw 55.B formerly stated: "all the departmental members of the Academic Senate must be afforded an opportunity to make their opinions known to the voters before a vote is taken."

Two years ago [emeritae/i] on one campus complained that they were not being notified of pending personnel actions and were being denied access to relevant files, so they could not form or express opinions. In a perversion of ordinary logic, statewide Rules and Jurisdiction rejected their complaint, ruling that the right to make their opinions known did not imply any right to notification of pending decisions or access to materials necessary to form an opinion. In order to correct this anomaly, the University of California Council of Emeriti [sic] Associations (CUCEA) proposed amendments to the Bylaws specifically granting emeriti/ae such rights of notification of pending actions and access to materials. The proposed amendments were approved by the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and the Academic Council. Before being presented to the Academic Assembly for final approval, the legislation was referred to the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) for pro forma review. In a classic example of chicanery, UCRJ rewrote the amendments so as to deny emeriti/ae not only the rights they sought but their previously assured right to be heard on personnel matters, and sent the amendments forward as pro forma clarifications of the amendments initially referred to them. Unfortunately, [emeritae/i] did not become aware of what had happened until too late to launch more than token opposition to the new proposals. Consequently the Legislative Assembly on May 4, 1995, adopted the amendments denying these rights unless granted by a two-thirds vote of departmental Senate members.

[This] Department has been exemplary in its fair treatment of [emeritae/i]. We have been receiving the same notices and minutes as active faculty. We have not asked and do not seek the right to vote on personnel matters. We merely ask that we continue to be treated as we have in the past. Favorable Departmental action on this request will reassure us that we are still accepted as welcomed and valued members of the Department.

Sincerely yours,

[Signed]

FOR LUNCHEON RESERVATIONS: Please mail this stub with your check (\$14 per person) payable to UCI EMERITAE/I ASSOCIATION. Send to Kivie Moldave, Treasurer at Room 515B, Administration Building, Irvine, CA 92717. [Tel. 714-824-6204]

NAME: _____ RESERVATIONS: _____ SPECIAL MENU: _____

_____ Cut on this line _____

ABOUT THE SPEAKER

MICHELLE FRENCH

◆ *Graduate of UC Davis*

◆ *Responsible for nine campuses, five teaching hospitals, three DOE Laboratories*

◆ *Serves 130,000 Employees and Retirees*

NEXT EMERITAE/I LUNCHEON MEETING

Thursday December 7, 11:45 A.M. to 2:00 p.m.

in

Room "C"--University Club

TOPIC: FUTURE OF HEALTH BENEFIT PLANS AT UC

What about the Prudential High Option and UC Care?

SPEAKER: MICHELLE FRENCH

DIRECTOR OF HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS

Office of the President, UC

(See stub above for reservation and other details)

We would appreciate corrections in address or contributions date shown on label below.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

UCI EMERITAE/I ASSOCIATION

Room 515 B Administration

Irvine, CA 92717