

Minutes
Executive Board of the Emeriti Society
Monday, June 2, 2014
DeRosa Center

Present: Ken Beauchamp, Judy Chambers, Roy Childs, Roland di Franco, Doris Meyer, Glee Scully, Jed Scully, Mike Sharp

1. The minutes from the meeting on May 5, 2014 were approved
2. Treasurer's Report: The April 25 Wine&Cheese lost \$89.13. Other expense totaled \$243.55 and the overall balance was \$1566.52. The Provost's Office has been billed for \$524.11; that reimbursement will bring the total to \$2090.63, \$721.66 greater than the balance of 6/30/13. The fiscal management decisions of the past year have borne fruit.
3. Bridge to Asia: current total is 45 boxes shipped, with more to come.
4. The role of the Emeriti Society in University governance:
 - Observations about current governance practice:
 - An increasing trend toward a pyramidal organizational/decision-making structure
 - Increasing lack of transparency of decision making
 - Shift from a participative to a consultative role for faculty in governance
 - Examination (by Doris and Roseann) of literature and communications from AROHE and googled sources have not revealed any instance of emeriti participating in higher education governance
 - Jed Scully suggests a "think" function (apparently he doesn't like tanks) for Society members entitled the Pacific Emeriti Group. The purpose of this Group would be to provide unbiased research related to proposed policy and practice changes. A point of this activity would be to bring greater transparency to institutional decision-making through data analysis and extra-institutional research unclouded by vested interest. Roy asked who would volunteer to serve this function, and suggested that the emeriti be asked to see if any one would be willing to take on such a task.
 - Roseann and several others cautioned that attempting to influence governance might be viewed by various stakeholders an illegitimate assumption of function. Attempting to be a positive influence may not be possible and could yield negative reactions potentially harmful to the Society's current status. Doris recommended that we avoid taking an adversarial stance.
 - Section 8.14 of the University Handbook describes the relationship of the Emeriti to the University. Subsection 8.14.3 is concerned with emeriti activities of benefit to the University. Part 4 of that subsection notes that representatives of the Emeriti

Society are eligible to serve “on University committees, especially those on which the lengthy service and perspective of the Society member might be of benefit.” Currently, the Society has one voting member of the Academic Council (Roland) and one nonvoting member of the University Compensation Committee (Ken). In addition, Jed was told by the Academic Council Chair that the current University grievance procedures are under review and the role of emeriti in that process has been changed to allow emeriti to participate as advisers to grievants should a grievant request such participation.

- It was decided that the Academic Council should be asked to initiate a discussion of the University Compensation Committee’s membership to change the emeriti representative’s position to a voting position. In addition the Academic Council should be asked to clarify the status of the revision of the grievance procedures.
 - It was decided that we would schedule a lunch meeting with the Provost (after the regular July meeting) and ask her what her response might be to the proposed independent research function. In addition it was suggested that we query her about the early retirement contract clauses that prohibit any teaching involvement post retirement.
 - It was suggested that we review AAUP position papers to assess what roles emeriti might play, and that the University’s commitment to AAUP principles might need to be brought to the attention of the Provost and President.
5. Next meeting: July 18 (Friday). Main agenda item: “connections.” Note we need to decide the content of fall W&C event(s) in order to contact potential speakers so that dates can be established.
6. Future items for discussion:
- I. 4 Month Co-Chair rotation schedule - All
 - II. Columbarium –awaiting a plan from Phil Gilbertson
 - III. Recruiting of emeriti to take on assignments such as AROHE participation, assistance to Mike re C&K, etc.

Co-Chair rotation schedule:

July: Ken and Rosie
August: Rosie and Roy
September: Roy and Bill
October: Bill and Glee
November: Glee and Skip

Ongoing Tasks

Luncheons: Judy & Bill

Wine & Cheese: Doris & Mike

Cabbages & Kings: Mike

List masters: Walt & Bill

Emeriti Society Monograph: Doris & Bill

Annual Update of Monograph: Emeriti Secretary

Oral History Project: Doris

Bridge to Asia: Roland

Provost's Office Contact: Roland

Retirement Dinner Liaison with Provost: Rosie

Welcome Letter to New Emeriti: Acting Chair

Academic Council Representative: Roland

University Compensation Committee: Ken

To Emeriti Society Ex Com
From Jed Scully
June 1, 2014

I catch Roseanne's drift. How to develop input or perspectives on subjects like university governance without irritating segments of the active duty University constituencies; versus continuing to perform basic service functions to our retired colleagues.

One thought might be our setting up a "think" function; whereby we might develop ideas into proposals through surveys, base line research and papers. A "think tank" is too grand a notion - but more of an institutional research function, where the institution is the Pacific Emeriti Society. After all, most of us were scholarly researchers of one sort or another. The PEG would be a service sub entity of the ES, and would allow the ES to continue in its now traditional role, without the distractions and possible blowback of appearing to propose change which would convert us into an active operational constituency.

Some of us remember that Lee Fennel did this kind of policy research both before and during his AVP tenure. One problem was that his operational and research roles were not always seen as separate; but ours could be, because the PEG would eschew an operational role. There are officers and faculty who perform these functions currently; such as the program evaluations just concluded. But these research and data collecting functions tend to be designed for operational reasons and are often confidential. PEG might be designed for data collection, system dissemination and transparency; but without any operational responsibility.

Just another minnow to throw in the fish pond.

Skip

June 1, 2014

Dear Emeriti ExCommas:

We have read Mike Sharp's agenda call for tomorrow and see that we again are asking the same questions of one another as we did last Fall; i.e. what is or should be the proper policy role for our Society?

This role definition *could* be put to one side while we deal with more pressing matters in the day-by-day. Informing our membership and each other of health coverages, access, and insurance items are one issue. Retirement financial planning is certainly another. Forming alliances with university retirement organizations is a third.

While these are appropriate concerns which touch all of us, some of us are still "role wrestling." Faculty, students, administrators, staff, regents, and alumni all have roles more or less defined by the organizational structure of American universities. The role of emeriti – used to be a respected honorific that allowed faculty to pursue scholarship, public service and – on occasion teaching, while retired from active service in the University. By mutual consent and assent, they might assume certain public service

functions, where their experience and distance from contemporary academic and administrative politics would provide longer range policy perspectives.

Examples of where this experience and distance was useful occurred during the Emeriti's assumption of the survey evaluation of the President during the WASC visits twenty years ago. A current example is the very useful role played by current Emeriti in resolution of policy concerning the Order of the Pacific.

What we would suggest as continuing roles in which Emeriti could bring their disinterested service to bear on University policy is (1) in providing advice and assistance to faculty considering Faculty Handbook issues in their relation to the University; (2) providing experiential perspective to the university's constituencies, on major structural and academic shifts in the university's historic mission and alignments; and (3) maintaining an emeriti group of experts available for university service *pro bono publico*.

The daily newspapers, (for those of us hopelessly addicted to physical print), regularly display scary scenarios of university planning missing the clubhouse turn. Witness, NYU's trouble with its Abu Dhabi campus, with allegations of near slavery of the work force compounded by outsourcing of many core university planning and execution functions.

Nationally, tuition increases charges well ahead of inflation rates; unsustainable debt loads over the long term haunt college and advanced degree graduates; the "privatization" of previously publicly financed state universities and colleges continues; and the ongoing outsourcing of core faculty teaching responsibilities to adjunct and contract teaching staff, are just a few of the issues facing every American university including our own.

At Pacific, we need to remind our community that the gale winds tearing at the rigging of the good ship McGeorge had been long forecast by factors unique to that campus and which simply accelerated national trends lessening the demand for lawyers. McGeorge is suffering from being the last ice skater in a Crack the Whip turn pivoting at the rear of some 140 law schools further up the line. It took out toxic mortgages on its future by failing to retrench when times were still good and sustainable; and failed to maintain its previous regional supremacy.

Assigning blame will not help to remedy this situation. And it is heartening to hear Regents and administrators willing to throw out the fiscal lifeboats in the short term, while McGeorge stabilizes. But the most important point for me is to not use the McGeorge situation as a template for the Stockton or San Francisco campuses. Their programs in the main are justifiably strong. Restructuring scenarios leading to reallocation of resources should proceed on the basis of demonstrated weakness in programs or demand, as at McGeorge, but such strategies are a much harder case to make for the rest of the University.

So there you have it! Every organization needs balance wheels and experienced input from those who are dedicated to the organization, but are beyond the conflicts of interest that inevitably affect those within the wheelhouse and the chartshack and the engine room.

Why not us? And why not now?

Faternally,

Skip