

Emeriti Activity Survey

We received a total of 90 responses indicating some scholarly or creative activity in retirement. Of those, 87 listed some relevant activity since they retired from full-time employment, with almost 70% saying they had published one or more peer-reviewed book chapters or articles and just over 1/3 saying they had published a book or monograph. Perhaps not surprisingly, the proportion of science, engineering and health retirees publishing peer reviewed papers was higher than average (80%), while the proportion of humanities retirees having published books was higher than average (at 50%).

Teaching and supervision were well represented, with almost half of the 87 having taught one or more undergraduate courses and over ¼ having taught one or more graduate courses. Over half had served on a PhD supervisory committee since retiring, while around ¼ had supervised or co-supervised a Masters student. Over half had given one or more public lectures, ¼ had appeared on radio or television or in print with expert commentary, and over half had participated in (or organized) an academic conference.

Half of the 87 had served as peer reviewers of publications and about 1/5 had acted as a referee on a tenure or promotion file. Only about 5% had served as a programme reviewer. Given the small number of fine arts faculty replying, it is perhaps not surprising that only around 10% had taken part in or provided advice to a theatre or music production or had contributed to a visual arts show. (I should note, by the way, that at least two colleagues from the *social sciences* have had shows of their own artistic photography after *they* retired.)

Only 69 respondents reported relevant activity in the past 12 months, perhaps reflecting a general diminution in activity as years go by. However in that group of past-year activities, authorship, reviewing and conference activity were quite high (over 40% in each case), while teaching and graduate supervision were reported by about a quarter of participants. Disciplinary differences were small among those active in the past year.

Of the 71 respondents who wished to continue their scholarly/creative activity hereafter, over 90% said they would find retention of professional expense reimbursement beyond the current deadline a significant help. Over half said competitive internal grant opportunities and better access to travel funds would be significantly helpful, and half thought more University recognition would be of high value. Around 1/5 cited more support for external funding applications and more opportunity to work with still-employed colleagues would be helpful. Almost 90% would apply for continuation of the PER if that were possible, though about ¼ would only do so depending on the degree of “demonstration of scholarly/creative activity” required. Two-thirds would apply if there were research/creative funds available, and just under half though \$10,000 would be a reasonable maximum grant. A few respondents cited a sum between \$2000 and \$5000 as sufficient, and a

couple said it would depend on the project. One noted that time was of more importance than money for their research. In the handful of “other, please specify” responses, greater recognition by the University was cited most often by those in humanities, social sciences and environmental studies, while science, engineering and health respondents cited office space as the leading concern.

With regard to post-retirement teaching, of the 70 who responded to the question 1/5 to 1/4 thought current opportunities were sufficient, and just under half said more access to teaching opportunities should come only if their unit could argue they were especially qualified. About 1/5 said such opportunities should be available without reservation, while just over 10% thought extra opportunities should be restricted to those with low pension.

Of the 59 who responded to the question on graduate supervision, almost 2/3 thought current rules were satisfactory, while just under 1/4 thought more remuneration was needed and about 15% thought more chances for supervision should be provided.

The earliest retirement date cited by 68 respondents who gave a date was 1993, while 11 retired within the last three years. Just under 30% of respondents came from each of humanities, social sciences, and science/engineering/health, while just over 5% came from each of fine arts/design and professional programmes. I must apologize for a survey design that gave inadequate attention to the special contributions of librarians, though some may have found it possible to respond to the categories provided.

What the results reveal, in my judgment, is that a significant number of our colleagues continue to make valuable contributions to their profession and the University in retirement, and a case can be made for more support and recognition of their efforts in future. To be sure, there was satisfaction with current rules in many cases, and there is no doubt that some colleagues have (happily?) taken advantage (by now at least) of the chance to be fully retired from scholarly/creative production. For those who remain active, ARFL will continue to argue for their support.