

# Council of University of California Emeriti Associations (CUCEA)

## Minutes of Meeting

April 26, 2017

UC Irvine

### Attending:

*CUCEA Officers:* William Ashby (SB) Secretary/Campus Representative; Richard Attiyeh (SD) Chair; Marjorie Caserio (SD) Web Manager/Newsletter Editor/Past Chair; Caroline Kane (B) Chair Elect/Alternate Campus Representative; Louise Taylor, Information Officer/Past Chair (B)

*Emeriti Association Presidents and Vice Presidents:* Steve Cederbaum (LA) EA President/Alternate Campus Representative; Jim Danziger (I), EA President/Campus Representative; Victor Lippit (R) EA President/Campus Representative; Dominic Massaro (SC) EA President/Campus Representative; Doug Mitchell (R), EA Vice President/Alternate Campus Representative; John Swartzberg (B), EA President

*Emeriti Association Representatives and Alternates:* Dan Mitchell (LA); Henry Powell (SD); G. Tom Salee (D); Ernest Newbrun (SF) Past Chair/Campus Representative.

*Emeriti Survey Co-Chair:* John Vohs (D).

*Center Directors and Liaisons:* Cary Sweeney (B)

### Call to Order:

Chair Richard Attiyeh called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. Introductions followed.

Richard introduced Jim Danziger, President of the UC Irvine Emeriti Association, who welcomed participants and gave a brief history of the Irvine campus and its accomplishments.

### Officers' Reports:

#### Chair's Report:

Richard Attiyeh reported that Rachel Nava (UC Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer), who was expected to address the Joint Meeting, was unable to attend. Consequently, the agenda of the Joint Meeting was restructured.

Richard then offered some information learned from The University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), of which he is an *ex officio* member representing CUCEA:

- The transition from Blue Cross to Optum Rx did not go smoothly. One OP official reported to the UCFW that 42% of pre-authorized prescriptions were initially declined by Optum Rx. This may have been because of technical problems in the way physicians were submitting

prescriptions. In any case, the OP is not happy with Optum Rx and is considering switching to Anthem Blue Cross. A decision will be made in the summer.

- The UC has been borrowing from the short-term investment pool and investing in the total-return investment pool, which has generated 6.5 million dollars.
- UC and Fidelity have reduced the number of investment fund options in the 403b plan. The number of options has been reduced from 64 to 16.

### **Secretary's Report/Approval of Minutes:**

William Ashby presented the minutes of the October 27, 2016 meeting at UCSC. No corrections were offered, and the minutes were approved unanimously. They will be posted on the CUCEA website.

### **Treasurer's Report:**

In the absence of Treasurer William Parker, Richard Attiyeh referenced the CUCEA financial statement that was distributed earlier by email. He noted that one campus had not yet paid their dues and that another campus had made partial payment. With the current dues structure, William Parker estimates that the balance (net worth) will decline by approximately \$1000 by the end of the calendar year. Richard then read a statement from William Parker: "The financial situation of CUCEA in 2016-17 will decline modestly as compared to the previous year. CUCEA retains sufficient financial resources for operation with the current assumption of dues and expenses for another one or two years." Richard reported that next year's dues are estimated at between 65 and 85 cents per living campus emeritus.

Richard then drew attention to UCSF association, which has been unwilling to conform to the new dues structure, as explained in the UCSF Campus Report. He then asked Ernest Newbrun to speak to this situation. Ernest Newbrun reported that UCSF has 121 paid members, in addition to another 28 members who are given complimentary membership for the first year. There is a total of 641 UCSF emeriti. UCSF has paid \$2 for each of the association members, as was called for in the previous version of the Bylaws. However, the UCSF Association executive board unanimously agreed that it could not pay for "ghost members" (i.e., emeriti who are not members of the Emeriti Association). Relatively few UCSF emeriti remain in San Francisco after retirement. It has proven difficult to recruit Association members who do reside in the area, despite extensive efforts. Consequently, the UCSF association cannot afford to pay dues based on per capita of all emeriti, as required currently by the Bylaws. The UCSF EA executive board feels that CUCEA has not done enough to reduce meeting expenses, to consider consolidating some of its offices, and to reduce the number of face-to-face meetings.

Steve Cederbaum noted that, although UCLA does not have the same financial difficulty, it has the same problem in recruiting new members. He sees a "great danger" in officer succession. Louise Taylor noted that this is also a problem at UCB. This seems to be a systemic problem throughout the university; for example, the Faculty Club at UCB also is having difficulty maintaining membership.

Don Massaro suggested a poll asking which campuses have had trouble with membership and leadership succession. Richard Attiyeh asked for a show of hands. Only three campuses reported that they were not having trouble in these areas.

Victor Lippit stressed the importance of adequate support from campus leadership.

Cary Sweeney noted that since UCB has moved to universal membership, more focus can be placed on projects and programs, rather than on recruiting new members. As a result, several new projects are underway, and attendance at luncheons and other events has increased.

Victor Lippit opined that CUCEA should recognize that there are two categories of Association members: paid members and “phantom members.” He suggested changing the Bylaws, so that CUCEA dues are again based on the number of paid members at each campus.

Dan Mitchell reminded us that the reason for the new dues structure was that UCB had decided to consider all emeriti as members of the Association and to no longer charge any Association dues. If we were to revert to the former structure of basing CUCEA dues on the number of paid association members at each campus, Berkeley would owe nothing.

Caroline Kane was asked how the new universal membership plan was working at UCB. She said it was too soon to tell, but that she would be able to report at the next fall meeting. She noted that the UCB Emeriti Association has become a support group for the University, making it possible for emeriti to make tax-deductible contributions indirectly to the Association. Caroline also reported that the Vice Provost at UCB has agreed to fund travel and lodging expenses for association leadership to attend CUCEA meetings. Caroline also noted that in the past, only around 20% of emeriti were Association members (ca. 200 out of 1000). Now all 1000 emeriti are Association members (unless they opt out), giving the association more credibility when discussing emeriti concerns with the campus administration.

Dan Mitchell suggested “changing the nature of CUCEA.” We could have a “zero-budget” CUCEA. CUCEA could continue to have some face-to-face meetings (perhaps along with on-line meetings), but it would be up to each campus association to decide whether to send delegates at their own expense.

Victor Lippit suggested that it should be possible to determine an equitable dues assessment for Berkeley, should we decide to revert to the former practice of basing dues on the number of paid members.

Jim Danziger asked about the historical imperative that led to the creation of CUCEA, and why two councils were created—one for emeriti and one for staff retirees.

Louise Taylor referenced two documents (later distributed by email and appended here) which show that CUCEA grew out of discussion among the campus emeriti associations, beginning in 1981. Thereafter, the Senate became the driving force that led to the creation of CUCEA. In 1986, The Musgrave Report, known as the “Magna Carta” of the University’s emeriti faculty, was endorsed by the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and subsequently by the Academic Counsel. Because CUCEA was consistent with recommendations in the Musgrave Report, in 1987 the Senate made a one-time grant of \$5000 to facilitate its creation. In 1988, the President announced to the Regents the establishment of CUCEA.

Louise reminded us that the dues together with an annual Senate grant covered CUCEA’s expenses until the Senate withdrew its subsidy ca. 2009<sup>[1]</sup>. Since then, CUCEA has reduced the number of officers whose travel expenses are covered.

Discussion then turned to the differences and similarities among the campus associations. Steve Cederbaum stressed the need to think to the future of CUCEA, emphasizing the need to somehow maintain the organization, despite campus differences. He referenced the importance of the Emeriti Activity Report and the need to sustain efforts to keep emeriti in the consciousness of the OP.

Marjorie Caserio noted that the number of emeriti has grown enormously since CUCEA was established. When the campus associations were formed, a larger percentage of emeriti elected to take membership in the associations. Although CUCEA was established to give a collective voice to the campus associations, it now has the responsibility of representing all emeriti,

irrespective of whether they belong to their campus association. The campus associations are primarily concerned with local matters, but the issues for which CUCEA has responsibility also relate to the Office of the President. Consequently, there is a “disconnect” between the associations and CUCEA. There is thus a need for CUCEA to “rephrase its objectives and mission,” building on the success of the Emeriti Activities Report.

John Vohs noted that the problem of diminishing collective engagement is more general in society, and not specific to the associations. While campus support of the associations varies by campus, CUCEA’s financial dilemma should be addressed by the Office of the President.

Jim Danziger asked whether emeriti and retirees have divergent goals and issues. Perhaps a new organization should be formed that would speak for both groups.

Tom Sallee argued that CUCEA needs to better articulate its *raison d’être*.

Henry Powell suggested talking to Senate leadership again before approaching the Office of the President for support.

Cary Sweeney reported that CUCRA is currently discussing the same issues. She noted that UC has 67,000 retirees. We need to emphasize the magnitude of this number.

Richard Attiyeh promised that this discussion would be continued. In the interim, he requested that Ernest Newbrun ask the UCSF Association to comply with the Bylaws and to reconsider making its full dues payment.

### **Information Officer’s Report:**

Louise Taylor presented highlights of the current campus reports, as shown in the following report:

**Berkeley** is creating Departmental Emeriti Representatives to improve communication on emeriti issues within and among departments. To date, about 36 have been appointed out of 70 departments.

**Davis** continues to host their “Coffee With Campus Leaders” series prior to their Executive Committee meetings. Because of these conversations opportunities for emeriti to engage with the campus in new ways are being explored.

**Irvine** is requesting appointment of an emerita/us to serve as campus-wide Counselor and Advocate for emeriti and pre-emeriti.

**Riverside** is attempting to establish an Emeriti/Retirees Center – the last of the 9 campuses. The Chancellor has not been enthusiastic due to the cost of hiring 1 FTE Director. However, the Chancellor has provided a 100+ year-old shack built for the Agricultural Research Station. Caroline Kane has provided Riverside with some history demonstrating benefits to a campus in having such a center.

**San Diego** hosts a special reception for potential members in March before their monthly program. This has led to increased membership. We have all benefited in learning about San Diego’s mentoring programs. Recently 40 donors to their Chancellor’s Scholars fund attended their Donor Recognition dinner and heard directly from select Chancellor’s Scholars on the life-changing impact of the Program.

**Santa Barbara** has launched a new monthly program on practical issues such as local housing options for seniors, estate planning, Apple support and antique appraisals. It has been well received, sometimes with overflowing audiences.

**Santa Cruz’s** Chancellor sponsored a Spring luncheon to discuss the state of the campus and other news. Other campuses might wish to encourage their Chancellor to do something similar as a means of keeping retirees interested in their campus.

I want to remind you to send me the names of the new President of your Emeriti Association and the CUCEA reps and alternate reps, if these change with the new academic year.

### **Web Manager/Newsletter Editor's Report:**

Marjorie Caserio distributed copies of the April 2017 issue of the Newsletter, which focuses on the history of the Panunzio and Dickson awards. She suggested that a future issue might include a summary of campus association reports. She also invited suggestions for additional topics.

### **JBC Draft Report:**

The Joint Benefits Committee's report was distributed and is posted on the CUCEA website. The report was accepted by unanimous vote.

### **The 11<sup>th</sup> Campus (Emeriti Activities Survey):**

Richard Attiyeh thanked John Vohs for agreeing to manage and edit the next Survey. John reminded us that the survey will launch in October, 2018. The "virtual 11<sup>th</sup> campus" theme will be continued. As usual, each campus will be responsible for managing and budgeting for the survey of its emeriti. The on-line survey was overwhelmingly preferred last time. Nevertheless, a paper survey will be available for those who prefer it. As more and more emeriti opt for the electronic version, costs should diminish. Each campus will be asked to designate a local manager of the survey.

### **Future Meetings:**

Caroline Kane stated that the representatives from the OP have understood our desire for more substantive discussion. She expressed satisfaction that slides of the OP presentation were received and distributed in advance of the April 27 Joint Meeting.

Caroline noted that the consensus at the October 2016 meeting was that face-to-face meetings were preferable to on-line ones. She noted that, in any case, the numbers involved in the Joint Meeting would make an on-line meeting nearly impossible. She reported that the Executive Committee had decided at its 11:30 meeting to request funding from the Office of the President, as well as the Academic Council.

The fall 2017 meetings will be held in Oakland at an airport hotel, on October 25-26. Details were to be provided at the Joint Meeting of April 27, 2017. Caroline reported that CUCRA, CUCEA, and the OP were in continuing discussion over planning, but that no decision had yet been reached as to how much financial support would be forthcoming from the OP.

Discussion ensued as to how often we should meet in Oakland. The consensus was that we should continue to meet there every two years.

### **Campus Reports:**

As reported above, Louise Taylor had summarized the campus reports (which are posted on the CUCEA website). Some campus representatives provided additional information.

- Henry Powell distributed the latest issue of the UCSD “EA Chronicles.”
- Jim Danziger reported that the strategic plan of UCI calls for greater engagement with emeriti. Consequently, he has encouraged every UCI dean to survey his or her emeriti regarding their recent activities and their willingness to participate in various activities. To date, several deans have begun the survey. This initiative has been endorsed by the Irvine Senate.
- Dominic Massaro reported the successful offering of a lifetime membership in the EA on the Santa Cruz campus.

There being no further business, Richard Attiyeh adjourned the meeting at 3:45.

Respectfully submitted,

William J. Ashby

First draft 4/30/17

Second draft 5/2/17

Third draft: 5/9/17

---

<sup>[1]</sup> The Senate continued to provide funding of around \$1500 annually until relatively recently, when cuts to its budget resulted in the elimination of its subsidy to CUCEA. It was decided early on that the campus Associations would also contribute to the financial operation of CUCEA.