

**COMMITTEE ON EMERITI RELATIONS
ANNUAL REPORT 2000-01**

To the Academic Senate, Santa Cruz Division:

The Committee on Emeriti Relations had a relatively quiet year after tension between one emeriti and an academic division over office space was resolved early in the Fall Quarter. The committee thanks Julia Armstrong-Zwart and the Office of the Provost for their important help in this matter. It hopes that the central administration will continue to take a pro-active role in relation to the needs of emeriti faculty.

During the rest of the academic year, the committee focused most of its attention on two proposals it developed last year on the basis of a survey of emeriti faculty.

First, the committee worked with CAP to create a policy whereby the title "Research Professor" is now potentially available to a larger number of emeriti, due to the establishment of a broader range of criteria and the delegation of authority for appointment to the divisional deans. The committee thanks CAP and Provost John Simpson for their help and responsiveness on this issue. The expanded criteria are as follows:

The emeriti professor provides evidence of publication of scholarly books, monographs, or journal articles;

The emeriti professor provides evidence of regular scholarly presentations at professional meetings;

The emeriti professor provides evidence of outside research funding or of a proposal to attain funding.

Second, after receiving advice from CEP, the committee sent Provost Simpson a revised proposal to increase opportunities for emeriti teaching. This proposal appears as an Appendix to this report. Later the committee obtained a copy of a somewhat similar proposal that the Berkeley Senate has made to its campus administration. This Berkeley proposal was then forwarded to Provost Simpson as meriting consideration. Although there has been no movement on the issue as yet, the committee hopes that the two proposals will be considered soon because they could be of use in (1) enriching the curriculum; (2) increasing the percentage of Senate members doing part-time teaching; and (3) staffing courses in the face of the large projected growth in student numbers.

The committee also discussed the difficult issue of office space for emeriti. Recognizing the fact that there will be increasing space pressures over the next several years, the committee believes that most emeriti need to think in terms of shared temporary office space that is negotiated on a year-by-year basis. Drawing on an instance brought to its attention, the committee also explored the possibility of courtesy extensions of temporary, part-time office space by active colleagues who are on leave or who do not use their offices during all work hours of each day. For many emeriti, simply having a courtesy space where they can meet students or work for a few hours a week may be all that is needed as a supplement to a home office. This possibility is more in the realm of a “norm” or shared understanding than a policy. The committee hopes that departments where several new retirements are likely might discuss it informally at a regular departmental meeting.

In the search for alternatives to office space on campus, the committee urged the Office of the Provost to take a careful look at a recommendation concerning office space for emeriti that emerged from an administration/emergiti task force on the Davis campus. The recommendation is phrased as follows in a Memorandum of April 17, 2000, from Robert D. Grey, Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor, to College/School/Division Deans:

“Departments/sections should provide one-time assistance to move personal effects to an off-campus location. Departments/sections should also consider allowing emeritae/i faculty to move their UC Davis computer to a home location or other off-campus location either on an extended loan or by declaring the equipment surplus.”

Based on its experience of the past two years, the committee thinks there are two simple points that can make arrangements for emeriti very easy if they are kept in mind by administrators, department chairs, and colleagues:

1. Emeriti vary greatly in what they would like from the campus, so it is essential for administrators/departmental chairs to talk personally and frankly with potential retirees before retirement occurs. For some, the goal is to continue research and have access to the title Research Professor. For others, it is an opportunity to teach from time to time, and for others it is shared temporary office space.
2. For many emeriti, their ties to their old campus routines gradually recede as other interests develop, so their requests of the campus should be seen by administrators as in large part transitional rather than as the permanent, long-term arrangements that some department chairs may worry about.

In closing, the committee is happy to report that no new complaints were brought to it this year. However, it would be good to have the policies concerning teaching opportunities and emeriti temporary office space proposed by this committee in place as soon as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

COMMITTEE ON EMERITI RELATIONS

Barry McLaughlin

Mark Traugott, *ex-officio*

G. William Domhoff, Chair

May 9, 2001

APPENDIX**RE: EMERITI TEACHING PROPOSAL**

December 22, 2000
Provost John Simpson

Dear John,

The Committee on Emeriti Relations would like to offer a policy suggestion concerning a mechanism to make greater use of emeriti as classroom teachers. Specifically, we recommend a central fund that could be drawn upon by divisions and departments to hire emeriti to teach courses that would fill in temporary gaps or enrich the curriculum. Given the small number of emeriti involved, the funds probably could be dispersed in a one-hour meeting of the EVC and the deans.

The committee thinks there are several good reasons to expand teaching opportunities for emeriti. First, this would provide the campus with courses from ladder-rank faculty in an era when there is increasing concern about courses being taught by temporary faculty, who may be without significant teaching experience, or may not be available to students for more than the one quarter they teach. Second, emeriti faculty might be useful in helping to serve an expanding student body while new regular faculty are being hired.

Third, making this opportunity available might help to overcome any reluctance to retire on the part of those senior faculty who worry that they might lose their connection to the campus. In an era when there is no mandatory retirement age and the campus is anticipating large numbers of retirements to renew its faculty, any dissatisfaction with the way emeriti are treated could disrupt future planning. Finally, providing opportunities for teaching would enhance the morale of emeriti faculty. This point is the original impetus behind our proposal. In a survey this committee conducted in November, 1999, it identified eight emeriti professors not scheduled to teach in 2000-2001 who would have welcomed the opportunity to do so. Several of them indicated they would be willing to consider teaching in a college course.

We want to emphasize that the proposed emeriti fund would be highly cost effective. In effect, the UC Retirement System is already paying the living expenses and benefits for these faculty members. The campus is in the enviable position of having to purchase only the teaching portion of their activities, and can do so on a per-course basis, at its discretion and at a favorable rate. As a result, for a relatively modest outlay, the program could serve a great many students. While departments naturally wish to be free to hire new faculty into vacated FTEs, that need not imply an automatic end to their relationship to emeriti faculty. On the contrary, not to make appropriate use of those still-active colleagues who wish to teach overlooks a valuable teaching resource, something that our campus may not be able to afford at a time of rapid expansion, when our ability to fill the ranks of the faculty with quality hires is in question.

We recommend a centralized fund for two reasons. First, some divisions and departments do not always have the resources that would allow them to hire emeriti, even though they know that the emeriti professors in their division remain strong teachers and provide useful courses. Moreover, it is not easy for a department chair to convince an academic dean to release FTE's to replace retiring faculty, and then ask the same dean for money to hire the emeriti faculty members to teach additional courses. Second, retirements fall very unevenly from department to department and division to division, which means that emeriti in some departments and divisions may have fewer opportunities than those in other departments. If each division were given a set amount of funds, there might be leftover money in some divisions and too little money in others in any given year.

If this concept were to be approved in principle, there would remain several issues that would need to be worked out:

1. What would be the compensation for such courses? Most of the emeriti who returned survey forms in Fall, 1999, said they would be willing to accept the salary that is currently paid by the campus for single courses. However, it might be well to dignify this program by making the compensation \$500 or \$1,000 more than what is paid to temporary faculty, or to use a sliding salary scale based on professorial rank and step at retirement, as was done with faculty who took Verip.
2. How many such opportunities would the campus provide each year? If the number is relatively few, would those who are not funded be put on a waiting list for the following year?
3. What percentage of the emeriti professors' compensation should be provided by the central fund and what percentage, if any, by the department or college?
4. Should there be separate funds for departmental and college courses in an attempt to induce more courses in the colleges?

Sincerely,

Committee on Emeriti Relations
G. William Domhoff, Chair