

## UCI EMERITI ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

APRIL 5, 2010

PRESENT: Dumars, Hamkalo, Horn, Hubert, Jevning, Lawrence, McCulloch, McLaughlin, Miller, Quilligan, Schnaubelt, Stephens, Tobis, Parten, Soley; Senate Chair Stepan-Norris was a guest.

I. The meeting was called to order by President Hamkalo at 9:02 AM. Lawrence noted that her phone number on the roster was incorrect. It should be (949)715-1030.

II. Minutes from the March 1, 2010 meeting were approved with possible additional corrections to be sent to Dick Frank.

III. Treasurer's Report – none

IV. Announcements from Hamkalo – Easton and Stephens have agreed to serve on the nominating committee, chaired by VP Quilligan. She summarized UCI's Bibliography data – there was a 23% response rate with a paucity in responses from the arts whereas responses from medical faculty emeriti were disproportionately high compared to other schools. She announced a field trip to the San Diego Zoo's Arnold and Mabel Beckman Center for Conservation Research on April 19 at 10:30 AM.

Invitations will be sent shortly. She reminded the group of the Post-Employment Benefits Forum to be held this afternoon from 3:30-5:30 in the Pacific Ballroom C in the Student Center. There will subsequently be a UCI Assembly Meeting on May 6 from 3:30-5:00 in Room 338, Aldrich Hall where UC Senate Chair Powell and Vice Chair Simmons will provide more details on important issues facing the retirement system and will answer questions. Hamkalo has been asked to coordinate responses of emeriti to the UC Commission on the Future Work Group Recommendations. She will forward the survey by email and asked Executive Committee members to forward their responses to her. The deadline for submission for the summary is April 29. Miller asked Hamkalo if she had received a response to our request to CUCEA Chair Hess to have a UCI representative, preferably Julian Feldman, on the Post-Retirement Benefits Task Force (PRBTF). She has not received a response.

V. Senate Update – Chair Stepan-Norris – Her remarks will be summarized for the sake of brevity. She noted that the PRBTF is visiting UCI today and indicated it has narrowed down recommendations to three options, which were not elaborated. Today's session will focus on new hires with some changes for existing faculty compensation accruals. She noted a more complete discussion will occur at the May 6 session noted in Section I above when the full range of options will be discussed and stressed how important it is to attend this session. Miller asked if there would be changes for existing emeriti and she indicated that, since health benefits are not vested rights, there could be changes in details. S-N suggested we invite a representative from CFW to answer questions. She is on the Commission Task Force Education and Curriculum Committee and stated that this group is evaluating how to save money and raise money in light of reduced funding from the state. They have a tight deadline with their first set of recommendations due in early March. Round I involved data collection with Round 2 devoted to broader issues such as whether to reduce the size of UC (possibly by closing a campus such as Merced) or reduce quality. UC clearly doesn't want to reduce quality. She noted that the systemwide CFW is concerned about slippage in faculty salaries and that the pension costs are huge. She directed us to the Senate website to access the 250 page Commission Report, along with a 2 page summary. Tobis asked if there's an increase in faculty loss systemwide due to the budget situation and the furlough program. S-N indicated that this is being monitored and will be looked at this summer when the one year furlough has

ended. Tobis asked if all the public universities are in the same situation as UC. She indicated some had experienced drastic cuts earlier than UC, resulting in increased tuition in most cases. There is a concern for UC vis-à-vis faculty loss if other institutions recover sooner than UC. Miller reiterated we didn't receive a response from Hess regarding our request (noted above) and S-N asked Hamkalo to forward the email to her.

VI. CFW Report – Hamkalo summarized the recent meeting. Chair Parker noted that the systemwide CFW is concerned about the lack of sufficient time for campus consultation prior to commenting on various policies coming out of OP. This is an ongoing discussion with no action yet.

VII. Newsletter – No report

VIII. Ethics Committee (EC) – For the sake of brevity (and the sanity of the acting secretary) a lengthy discussion following Chair Tobis' recommendation on the charge of the EC will be summarized to emphasize the salient points. The Committee (Hubert, Lawrence, Miller, Quilligan, Tobis, Hamkalo-exofficio) met and makes the following recommendation: "There was unanimous agreement that the Committee should continue, and that there should be rotation of membership. There was consensus of those who were present (all above with the exception of Miller) that the Committee should only deal with generic issues. The Committee is not an investigative body. Further, the Committee should consult with the Executive Committee of the Emeriti Association in addressing those issues." Miller arrived after the above was agreed upon and expressed strong opposition to the fact that the Committee wouldn't address specific allegations. After his statement, the Committee took another formal vote but none of those present modified her/his position on the above recommendation. Dumars asked if there was a welfare component to the Committee response. Tobis replied this wasn't discussed. It will be addressed in the subsequent By-Laws discussion. Miller restated his position and asked why we shouldn't investigate specific incidents to our own satisfaction. There was no response. He acknowledged Lawrence's arguments against specific investigations (detailed in an email to him); Miller countered that our concern for UCI and the collective wisdom of those who have been at UCI for a long time position us to do the investigations he proposed. He further noted that restricting ourselves to generic issues indicated that we're unwilling to consider specifics. Tobis restated Feldman's position at the time the Committee was formed that uninvited comments aren't appreciated by any official body, the basic argument against Miller's position. Discussion ensued concerning whether or not other administrative bodies (such as those involved in compliance) could evaluate specific problems. Hubert noted that specific issues give rise to generic ones, the latter dealt with by the Committee recommendation. Quilligan noted that serious investigations are very time-consuming but that superficial investigations are not useful. Horn queried the definition of "generic" with the concern that it could be unclear to those who follow us. Lawrence amplified on Hubert's statement using the example of the issue of freedom of speech that resulted from a specific incident and emphasized that the Committee statement represented a principle. Tobis moved and Lawrence seconded (paraphrased), that anyone on the Executive Committee, and any member of the UCIEA, can ask the Executive Committee to inquire into particular problems for direction as to how the EC should proceed (i.e., support going forward or not). Additional discussion ensued, largely reiterating positions previously enumerated above. Miller raised the question if the EC is large enough to look into allegations. Lawrence again noted our lack of authority and that we have a limited role: if we believe significant issues aren't being addressed that we could endorse that the issues be looked into by the person or body with authority. Schnaubelt noted that she was involved in many ethical issues during her career at UCI and as a member of the Executive Committee for several years and noted that the group is

interested in general principles and the issue of confidentiality is paramount in investigations but without authority, can confidentiality be assured? She suggested we might participate in committees, such as those involved in grievances, where we could provide beneficial input. A vote was called and the motion passed 13-1 with 2 abstentions.

IX. By-Laws – Dumars and Horn led the discussion concerning the newest version of the revised By-Laws, which will be voted on by the general membership at the June 7 annual meeting. Dumars did not receive any changes from the Executive Committee relative to the most recent version distributed. Miller noted that, based on subsequent events, it would be wise to separate Ethics and Welfare as currently presented in the By-Laws. Article 9, Section 5 describes the Ethics and Welfare Committee. Horn noted there are duties proposed in this article that differ in some ways from today's discussion. Dumars raised the question whether there should be a single committee or two separate committees. Miller made a motion to separate the Ethics and Welfare Committee to form two committees. Motion was passed with 9 for, 4 against. Miller then made a motion that we not require email votes of emeriti in order to make recommendations on behalf of UCIEA. Hamkalo seconded. Horn added a friendly amendment to eliminate Article VII, Section 5. Quilligan seconded. Lengthy discussion followed. Horn withdrew her motion and the motion by Miller passed unanimously.

Horn indicated she and Dumars need wording for the duties of the two committees just voted on. Miller will check with Feldman re the Welfare Committee. McLaughlin indicated that the description as written is a "catchall" and could suffice. Horn noted that, according to Roberts' Rules, once approved by the Executive Committee, the total revision (without changes from previously approved By-Laws) will be sent to the membership. Hamkalo noted that they should be directed to the website to see the old version.

X. Center Update – Schnaubelt reported for Frederick. She indicated golf lessons would be part of the golf tournament. She reminded the group of Frederick's email that two lectures remained in the Healthy to 100 series. There is a power point presentation from each lecture that can be found on the Healthy to 100 website ([HR.uci.edu](http://HR.uci.edu) links to that website). Schnaubelt noted that there was a lot of interest in the possibility of repeating the Healthy to 100 series next year. She noted that the ARC room was free, the speakers were volunteers and that Kaiser donated refreshments.

She attended the field trip to the Ocean Institute and found it great. The Institute has volunteer opportunities from clerical to docent. Miller asked if this trip could be repeated next year. Schnaubelt said that it's possible if there's sufficient interest. However, there may be a cost involved because the docents (from UCI and UCLA) donated their time and there was no admission charge normally charged. Miller noted that the trip to the Getty was well-received but Schnaubelt stated that there is no staff to organize travel (e.g., buses). Stephens also noted possible liability issues. Miller noted CUCEA has looked into this but, Schnaubelt noted, as a support group, our liability is covered.

XII. Exit Interview Project – Miller noted the significance of confidentially issues vis-à-vis what might be available to the press. With respect to this project, Hamkalo met with Doug Haynes, director of the ADVANCE program, his assistant, as well as Kirsten Quanbeck, Assistant EVC and Director, Equal Opportunity and Diversity. She also had a phone conversation with campus counsel Diane Geocaris. Haynes indicated that he'd be interested in participating in the project and, since ADVANCE has an instrument in place, we could simply use it with some possible "tweaks". Quanbeck told Hamkalo that a letter was routinely sent with a paper survey to faculty who are leaving with the possibility of talking to someone. Surprising, the response was very poor. Quanbeck's interpretation is that faculty prefer to

speak to faculty and/or they assumed interviews with OEOD were only relevant if harassment and such were involved. Geocaris believed that, if the original documents were destroyed once data were inputted and putting it either in an academic personnel file or consider it personnel-related, it would remain confidential. She did say that original documents shouldn't be destroyed if the interview revealed that the interviewee was aware of litigation involving someone or if the interviewee made allegations of misconduct or there was a violation of UC policy or the law, there is no guarantee of confidentiality and we would be obligated to report such infractions. Miller asked Hamkalo to ask Geocaris for a letter to have on record regarding the confidentiality issue. Hamkalo will ask.

Meeting was adjourned at 11AM. Next meeting – Monday, May 3 at 9AM

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Hamkalo, Acting Secretary