UCIEA ExCom Meeting Thursday, March 1, 2012

I. Meeting was called to order by President Quilligan at 10:31, and adjourned at 12:00 pm. Present were: Kenneth W. Dumars, Julian Feldman, Pamela Lawrence, Ron Jevning, Susan Lessick, Judy Horn, Ted Quilligan, Stuart Krasner, Marianne Schnaubelt, Jeri Frederick, Barbara Hamkalo, Sam McCulloch, Ron Miller, Marilyn Soley, Garland Parten, and Ann Heiney.

II. Readings of January and February minutes, as amended by Ron Miller and re-done by Dick, are approved without corrections. Ron M.: Minutes should not be posted until approved. Ted agreed; he will tell Dick. Jeri, Dick and Marilyn will work out who sends the minutes to Carol Gardner for posting on the website, but that will be done only after they have been approved in the board meeting.

III. Meeting with Mike Arias: Marianne and Ted discussed two matters with Mike: he will back us up to $5,000 on funds for the upcoming meeting of CUCEA, CUCRA; on the request to move Jeri’s position into full-time position and possibly provide some help for her in that position, Mike promised to fight for it when the budget talks come up but as of yesterday, no news.

IV. Membership Committee: Cal McLaughlin regrets he could not be here to report on membership; he will get back to Ted. Henri Colt, a new emeritus in pulmonary and critical care who will be joining us, came too early and left, but will try to join us.

V. Ethics Committee: Ron M., as Chairman of the Ethics Committee suggested changes in the By Laws describing the functions of the Ethics Committee, which now inappropriately describe a hospital ethics position. He recommended the following changes: 1) The committee may consider generic and systems issues with ethical implications, concerning practical applications such as business ethics, clinical ethics, etc., not the theoretical problems under the jurisdiction of the Department of Philosophy. 2) Our committee should offer our services to the Campus Academic Senate, when time permits submitting it through the Emeriti Subcommittee, the Council on Faculty Welfare. 3) We should identify potentially ethically vulnerable activities such as the selection of the source of embryos for embryonic stem cells research, and suggest ways to avoid such activities. 4) The committee may review ethical issues that may arise or may have already arisen, on the campus and consider how emeriti might assist in preventing such problems in the future or in detecting them sufficiently early that harm to faculty, staff, students, research subjects, or patients is minimized, or how the Divisional Senate might respond. Discussion: Ted: It significantly broadens the activities of the Ethics Committee. Ken: It will be brought back to this committee after the Ethics Committee reviews it. (Agreement) Pam: It’s premature to discuss it before the Ethics Committee reviews it; I would like to see a written response. Ron M.: Since we only have a couple more meetings before the annual meeting and in the past we’ve had problems getting a by-laws change to the membership before the annual meeting, it ought to be brought up. Pam: We’ve talked about this before and I support the concept. There has been concern in the past that the Ethics Committee not turn into a vigilante committee, but I don’t make that step from this proposal. If you’re going to have an ethics committee, this is along the lines of what an ethics committee
should be doing. Julian: The only issue is that of emphasis; it looks like the major activity of the Emeriti Committee is the Ethics Committee. Judy: The Committee is a little more detailed than the other committees, but it is not so cut and dried as e.g. awards, more what we’ve chosen it is going to do, but the proposal might be even more specific. (Ted reads the proposal aloud.) Ron M.: The item on the development of guidelines, as well as that on the development and implementation of procedures for review of issues are largely unnecessary because it’s so much of what the current problem is. Julian: A nother issue is item 3 on this proposal: Shouldn’t it read “talk to this group before talking to the Academic Senate”? Ted: “Offer the services to the Academic Senate through the Council on Faculty Welfare”, so it’s bypassing this committee. Ron M.: Julian is right that it ought to be explicit that it comes through this committee. Barbara: I’m struggling with #4: how’re you going to get potentially vulnerable activities? Ron M.: The example I gave is embryonic stem cell research, in which we clearly identified a concern where for lack of proper advice, an imprudent choice of a local fertility clinic was made. Barbara: How was that activity pointed out? Was that by our Ethics Subcommittee? Ron M.: By me, before we had an ethics committee. The use of embryos, especially for research, because of the Dickey-Wicker Amendment, remains a problematic issue for society. Ken: These are just recommended changes, not even proposed changes, to be considered by the Ethics Committee. It takes an Ethics Committee meeting to freely discuss the program. Rather than just this committee, I’m suggesting that the Ethics Committee take the discussion of today and come up with a more specific proposal. Ted: Because it’s general, would #4 be better for a By Law? (Agreement) Send it to the Ethics Committee to discuss and Ethics Committee send it to us. (General agreement) Ron M.: I call an Ethics Committee meeting 40 minutes prior to the next Emeriti meeting.

VI. Aldrich Award: Ron M.: I tried to call Carol Gardner re Aldrich Award but she was not in office; I’ve heard nothing further. If anyone has news of the Ayala Committee, it would be of interest.

VII. Exit Interviews: Barbara: In January, I sent a message to Herb Killackey asking if his staff could separate the list of those who left into faculty who have separated because they are going somewhere else and faculty who have left because they didn’t get tenure; and also if they could provide us with an equivalent list for non-senate academics. After sending Herb several reminder emails, I just received a message from one of his staff saying that her analyst is sick this week but as soon as she is back, she’ll get on it.

VIII. Joint CUCEA/CUCRA Meeting: Jeri: Irvine is the host campus and the Emeriti Association, Retirees Association, and the Center are hosts. M arianne created the forms, which went out this week to all CUCEA and CUCRA representatives, inviting them to Irvine for this System-wide meeting, April 25-26. If you want to participate to meet colleagues from other emeriti associations around the system, plan to attend some sessions. Thanks to Ted, we have the restaurant arrangements at Gulliver’s, near the airport hotel. At the Beall Center, the tour is set; Ted will reconfirm the docent-led tour. Members of the Emeriti Executive Committee and the Retirees Executive Committee are encouraged to attend the tour and serve as greeters, as has been the custom at other campuses. Meetings will be held within the Atrium Hotel, facilitating moving from one activity to another. The Beall Center and the shuttle from the Atrium Hotel to
the Beall Center are wheelchair accessible. Marianne: For volunteers, Judy, Susan and I are meeting after this meeting and will get some people from the Retirees Advisory Board to help with the details. We hope for two representatives from your group and one or two from the retirees association to work on those details. On the day of the meeting, since Wednesday afternoon is all emeriti, I hope for representatives from the emeriti group. Garland, Marilyn, or whoever will be in charge of passing out the packets and name tags, greeting people. I have one or two retiree volunteers for all day Thursday. Any who want to be there in the morning for the Office of the President meeting and to greet and host are most welcome. For Wednesday afternoon, as the meeting starts at 1 pm, volunteers will probably be needed at 12:30 but details remain to be worked out; several have volunteered. Jeri: It’s great we've invited Dr. Frank La Ferla, especially as it ties in with the Beall exhibit. We will have our April meeting at the beginning of the month, thus allowing last minute details to be worked out then. Volunteers Barbara, Ann and Ron, and whoever wants to volunteer should contact Marianne or Jeri and be there Wednesday at 12:30 to be told their duties.

IX. Annual Meeting: Ted: At the annual meeting on June 5, 10 am, Professor William Schonfeld has agreed to speak on the future of the U of C; Jeri will send him a reminder.

X. Treasurer’s Report: Stuart: We have approximately $7,391.27 as of the end of January, which puts us ahead of December. There were no major expenses beyond the month to month, with dues trickling in. Jeri: Usually, every year, between 70 and 100 emeriti pay dues, out of around 350 total, which looks good as a percentage. At any campus, emeriti groups tend to be small and more core active. As a lot of new emeriti don’t have a link to older emeriti, outreach would be great when you have the chance. Barbara recommends this as a newsletter article. Ken: Have receipts for dues paid been sent out? Jeri: Receipts for donations come from Foundation directly to you; it should be automatic. Any who have not received receipts should call Foundation and speak to Gay White in 100 Theory, the one who sends Stuart the reports every month on what we have.

XI. Senate Update: Ted: I have a promise from the head of the University Senate to come and talk. Prof. Martens will be here next month, at the next meeting at 11 am, to give us a Senate update.

XII. Council on Faculty Welfare: Julian: In the Chair’s report there were reports of discussion on online invitational issues in the cabinet meetings. In the University CFW, there was a major discussion on health benefits cost; despite everything that has gone on in the past couple of years, there is going to be another push to cut the cost of health benefits for the University, which means more cost for us. It’s not clear how long the deal that was reached for retirees and emeriti will last. The sub-committee on Emeriti Affairs met; Julian tried to convince them to consider a project in which the emeriti provide unsolicited advice to the Administration on how to run the University, patterned after an article in the NY Times where people were encouraged to solicit advice from senior citizens about life in general. So I’m going to grab some of these questions for their consideration at their next meeting.

On faculty welfare issues, there was more discussion of silent membership for clinical faculty, and after the meeting the Chair circulated a note in which he said he was still
confused about whether or not some arrangements were made to provide membership in the College of Medicine Senate for clinical faculty: would that result in these people becoming members of the Campus Senate? At this last meeting it was thought it would not, but in minutes from some months ago, some thought it would. Julian will try to clarify that issue. The concerns of the clinical faculty are not only involvement in senate activities but housing priorities, and also sabbatical privileges. Ron M: The latter two were ones which in its previous discussions, Faculty Welfare had recommended be addressed by further consultation with the dean etc., and they sent the letter to the dean of the medical school for that purpose. Julian: If most of the money supporting the clinical faculty comes from the patients’ fees, how do they arrange for money for sabbaticals, do they create a fund? Ron M: Clinical faculty don’t get sabbaticals. Julian: Yes, but if they’re talking about how to supply clinical sabbaticals, where’s the money going to come from? Ron M: Similarly, the clinical faculty need time to teach, rather than simply continue to practice medicine to provide for their salaries, and to have time for research, clinical research but nevertheless research. Although money is short all round, if the School of Medicine wishes to have clinical faculty, they ought to make it reasonably different from private practice in a community; part of that difference is teaching and part is research. Pam: Those are huge issues. Ron M: And back to the issue that if the Academic Senate of the School of Medicine allows clinical faculty to have representation on its Executive Committee that would have nothing to do with their membership in the overall Campus Divisional Senate. Ted: The committee voted unanimously to recommend to the Senate that an experiment be done, that certain members of the clinical faculty, with 5 years or full professors or whatever, be permitted to sit on the Faculty Senate of the School of Medicine. There was no vote on housing: They have 3 tiers of classification; the clinical faculty fits into Tier 3, and they never have been even close to Tier 3. What they talked about was moving them up to Tier 2.5; the discussion died. Discussion of whether membership in School of Medicine Senate automatically qualified them for the College Senate had most thinking it did not, but they were going to check to make sure. Ron M: I propose a motion that representatives of this committee who are on the Emeriti Subcommittee of the Council on Faculty Welfare bring to the attention of the committee the recommendation that this experiment have to do only with the Senate of the School of Medicine. Ted: That has been voted on by the entire committee on Faculty Welfare and passed up to the Senate. Ron M: But it has not been sent to the Academic Senate Executive Committee of the School of Medicine. Ted had recommended that that discussion await next fall. Ted: OK, we’ll make that change. Let’s deal with this other business. Ann: How long is this pilot to go on until it is evaluated? Ted: After all parties have agreed on it, then with lots of help, we design details of how it will be worked out. Those of us most concerned in seeing this happen have suggested a 2-year experiment.

Julian: The other faculty welfare issue that generated much discussion last month is the suicide of a faculty member who had not been advanced. The chair of the CFW reported this matter to the Senate Cabinet and they turned around and asked me to review the current procedures that would be affected and to report back to the Senate Cabinet so we can establish a committee out of the CFW and report to the Council; this issue is still very much open. Barbara: When I met with Mike Arias, I brought this up and he said they are already putting plans into effect to have some sort of training modules for chairs and deans for when these kinds of issues come up. Julian: A notice to people to sign the revised University patent agreement came by electronic mail. Ted: Most universities have patent agreements, and there’s wide diversity in how they divvy up the royalties.
XIII. Newsletter: Ted: Bob has received only a submission from me. I suggest that with funds we send an electronic version when we want to get an item out quickly. An article on reaching out to new emeriti or retirees would be helpful, and suggesting topics that readers might write on might produce results. Bob cannot create a newsletter out of nothing; there used to be people willing to write about their trips. Ron M.: We could use synopses of delivered lectures. Jeri: Speakers have been willing to give copies of their notes, their power point presentations e.g., the Healthy to 100 lectures of interest to retirees and emeriti. They’re too busy to write a paragraph summary but perhaps Bob or someone could edit for a submission. Barbara and Ted offer help on that. Julian: Perhaps we should rethink the newsletter. The 24 hour 7 days a week cable channels and online resources could be checked; someone could cull items to pass on to readers who do not have access to online sources. The 3 or 4 times a year newsletter may be out of date. There have not been complaints of missing the newsletter, and emeriti mostly have online access, but if it is missed, we should find out.

XIV. Campus Housing: Barbara: When I met with Mike A., I brought up the letter from Richard Orr, which he had not seen, saying that the campus is not currently interested in on-campus housing for retirees. (This morning I asked Jeri to get a copy of that letter.) Whether Belmont’s fault or Richard Orr’s, it completely misinterprets the proposal. So he sent the letter to the senior vice-president of Belmont and only copied it to Vice-Chancellor Michael's, who’s in the Budget Office: as follows: “Dear Mr. Lasarde, Executive management has reviewed your proposal for on-campus senior housing. The campus is not ready at this time to pursue this development (here’s the misunderstanding--) such a use may be of interest in the future when there is a larger retired group living in our own campus housing. However, there is no current projection as to when this will occur or the reality of actual need of the faculty at a specific time in the future.” The proposal was misinterpreted by either Belmont or Orr when he reported to upper level executive management that we were only interested in on-campus housing for retired faculty who currently live in University Hills. And that’s a complete misrepresentation. I copied the letter and next time I see Mike, I will give it to him and explain the situation. Ted: Where are we in the survey? Jeri: So far we have received 121 emeriti responses, all very interested or somewhat interested except for 10 not interested, and 146 retired faculty and staff responses, of which only 9 were not interested. We have the data that Marilyn and Garland have been going through in this survey. (Some have called Jeri to ask if they should remove their deposits from Regents Point and she has to say it won’t be that quick. Others want their name on the list, which doesn’t exist.) Emeriti notices have been out since the dues notices went out, at the beginning of January and the faculty/staff since end of January. Ted: At some point we must cut it off and summarize and present the results. Jeri: Surveys have been made available at Healthy to 100 lectures, the last of which is next Tuesday, which would be a good cut-off, as the Chancellor’s Reception is the end of April, making responses too late. Ted: So first of April. Stuart: The original site was at the edge of campus on Bonita Canyon Drive. Barbara: But another potential site would be the north campus, where there would be less impact on what’s happening on the main campus where a multi-story building is possible, with shops, because there’s lots of room. So now there are 2 potential sites. The downside is there would have to be shuttles to connect to the main campus, but that’s not a major issue there, as it is at the corner of the south campus, where people would not walk to the campus buildings anyway. Jeri: A negotiable point would be that inducement, that the shuttle would be offered, as it is at Regents Point and at Belmont; this is a value that we bring to the negotiations, our awareness of this need because we
know our population, as Richard Orr may not. Ann: Does something need to be done re litigation about Orr’s letter? Barbara: I will present the letter to Mike Arias; Ted now knows about it and he deals with Mike. Ted: I would like to get the survey done and with its results, set up a meeting with Mike or somebody, Mike and Mike, to present the survey to them and say “Look,” because they are going on an old survey, one done only on the people living on the campus, the least likely ones to want to move. Ron M.: There’s also an old survey by Mary Watson that Julian knows about. But where are we re Belmont? Although we may want to entertain proposals from other builders, is it unwise to alienate Belmont? (General murmur that Belmont is very interested, like any developer, because we have land.) Some time ago Dick Frank brought a description of another developer: At the Belmont at UCLA, the formula was no money down and substantial payments; at the other one, it was a bigger down and smaller monthly payment, and in addition, the possibility, if the buyer left, passed away, they would pro-rate the down payment and give money back. Two very different proposals. There are many other developers to offer other such proposals but Belmont’s presentation with pictures of other sites and our visits to their UCLA site were very positive. Our site has greater potential because it’s closer to campus and not restricted to a very small footprint. We can assume Belmont would be willing to consider any changes we would want, e.g. both payment options. That was one of the things in the survey. Ted: We will finish the survey by April 1 and try to present to Mike and Mike or somebody by the middle to the end of April.

XV: Retiree Association: Marianne: The Chancellor’s Reception is the Monday after CUCRA/EA, and we’re going to have the art show again. I’m pretty sure I have volunteers Carolyn Moore and Carol Stanley again. The Retirees Advisory Board has decided this year to contribute $1000 to the staff scholarship funds. Faculty and staff are considered part of and can join and pay dues to the Retiree Association, but it’s primarily retired staff; we thought it a good effort to provide help to staff who apply for small amounts of money to advance their education in some way. Anne Paden passed away in February; the Retiree Board overwhelmingly decided to rename the golf tournament in her honor: The Anne Paden Memorial Golf Tournament. It is in June, right before the annual meeting. Jeri: I have been asked where to donate money in her honor: she has a charity called the First Tee, a golf charity teaching underprivileged youth how to play. I will send out that information.

XVI: Center Activities: Healthy to 100 and Beyond has been very successful and well attended, 70 to 100 people, and I’ve received notes of gratitude. Our extending the invitation to active employees in the community makes us ground breakers in the UC system; others in the system do not open events to the community at large or the active staff, as we do.

XVII: OLLI: Peggy could not be here but she reminds us we can attend one class for free.

XVIII: Other Business: Ron M.: I suppose we are sending a letter re Anne Paden. Has a letter been sent from the committee to Myra Fono about Jerry Tobis? The By Laws specify that the Secretary send a letter to the surviving spouse or significant other.

A propos of the By Laws, have we an annual budget this year yet? Normally, we have that at the beginning of the year, but the last 2 years we haven’t had it until near the end of the year. Jeri: From the Center’s point of view, we have the same annual budget, which was only about $4000 a year for the whole budget. For the Emeriti, we haven’t made a formal budget. Stuart: In the past we didn’t make a formal budget because we didn’t know how much we would
receive from the campus. Now, we don’t get very much and the way we set things up is ad hoc, as we see how much we have. Jeri: We could, though, work it up based on the last couple of years. Ron M.: If there were a deficiency we could ask for more. Stuart: We do ask for more. Jeri: That’s from the Center. When it was folded into the Center, they had me do the budget, but for the last 2 years we didn’t get an answer to the budget until near the end of the year and I then got a 40% budget cut. We haven’t done that for the individual emeriti. Ron M.: We can’t advocate for ourselves unless we know. Jeri: You all have more money than I do right now, so it would be good to have your own budget. Technically, I only have $4000 for an entire year now to do programs for 4000 people, but you now technically have $7000, and the Retirees is doing better than the Center, so we might do better with individual budgets for the individual associations.

Ron M.: At the annual meeting we are to elect officers and to elect 5 of the 10 elected members-at-large for a 2 year term, so we ought to be preparing for that. Should we have list of the members of the Executive Committee and should we, as in the By Laws, omit those who regularly fail to attend? A letter was to go to people who had failed 3 times to see if they wanted to be kept on or not. Another question: are our standing committees active? Another, are we proactively soliciting membership? And are we making recommendations about the various awards? January and February minutes as posted still contain, as I mentioned earlier, the sensitive sentence, and at least that ought to be corrected. Also, if we were to approve the January minutes at this meeting, we probably should have had them here to approve as modified. Re the February minutes, for which you asked for changes, there are a number: certainly the description of what I reported with regard to the Ethics Committee is not in keeping with my understanding of what I reported. Also for a few other changes where I thought significant changes could be made, only some of the recommendations were considered. Rather than take up more time to go through the details, I would be glad to send them to the appropriate person. Dick finds the computer program called Track Changes difficult to use, so sometimes he asks me to do it again, other times he delegates it to Marilyn. Ted: Send it to Marilyn and have her send it on to Dick to look over and send me a copy as well.

Ron M.: Is the Website Committee still active? For example, the Winter Newsletter is still not on the website; and for another, it states that Julian is the editor. Ted has the list [of members of the Website Committee] at home.

Meeting is adjourned at 12 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Ann Heiney, Acting Secretary

NEXT MEETING THURSDAY, APRIL 5, 2012
10:30 AM, 111 THEORY
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