

Council of University of California Retiree Associations (CUCRA)

October 27, 2022

8:00 a.m. – 12 noon

Fall Meeting

Zoom meeting hosted by Berkeley

ATTENDEES:

UC Berkeley: Barinder Flanagan, Marian Gade, Camille Koue, Patti Owen, Cary Sweeney, Marty Takimoto, Louise Taylor, Elise Woods

UC Davis: Jo Anne Boorkman, Juliane Crowley, Emily Galindo, Dianne Gregory, John Meyer, Larry Thao

UC Irvine: Craig Behrens, Cindy Fern, Jeri Frederick, Jill Halvaks, Emil Nguyen, Pat Price, Marianne Schnaubelt

UC Los Angeles: Sue Abeles, Sue Barnes, John Dahl, Ayesha Dixon, Elaine Fox, Adrian Harris, Jack Powazek

UC Merced:

UC Riverside: Bob Daly, Cristina Otegui, Andy Plumley, Karim Zahedi

UC San Diego: Mae Brown, Henry Powell, Matthew Xavier

UC San Francisco: E. Eastman, Gail Harden, Eric Vermillion, William Wara

UC Santa Barbara: Robert Mann, Ellen Pasternack, Kim Summerfield

UC Santa Cruz: Christy Dawley, Lee Duffus, Bill Parro, Frank Trueba

LANL: Morris Pongratz

LBNL: Nancy Brown, Robert Cahn

LLNL: Jeff Garberson

PARRA: Karen Akerson, Jim Dolgonas, Bill Newton

UCOP: Bernadette Green

Welcome

John Meyer called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m. and welcomed the attendees.

Approval of Minutes

Patti Owen presented the minutes from the April 28, meeting, noting a few typos. There was a correction from the floor regarding the membership of the reserve policy study group. It was moved and seconded that the minutes be approved with the corrections. They were adopted unanimously.

Chair's Report

John went over the agenda for the meeting. He pointed out the report posted to the meeting website which highlighted the last six months. The big issues were:

- 1) Frustration with RASC
- 2) The Navitus change and the lack of response to the issues raised
- 3) Office of the President's look at Via Benefits

He outlined what was working and not.

--RASC still has problems; the Survivor Benefits issue and its effects on individuals and families.

--There has been continued engagement between CUCRA and CUCEA

--There have been no responses regarding Navitus

--With VIA Benefits, there is frustration that the dollar amount provided has not changed for fifteen years. Is there a possibility of adding providers?

Marian Gade asked about UC Health. John explained UC Health administers self-insured programs, not health. There are two separate units at UCOP involved with benefits. UC Health has its own staff for managing the health plans. Having two entities is a failed governance flaw, especially when they are not coordinating. Jim Dolgonas explained that UC Health coordinates with the state on academic programs and issues and has a whole programmatic organization. HMOs are not popular with UC Health and the medical center directors. However, staff and retirees at all salary levels use Kaiser and like the HMO model. Frank Trueba noted that there is a business philosophy which drives the decision making, not customer service. Human Resources equals service and UC Health equals money.

It was pointed out that there are too many acronyms. Someone asked about BENET. It is a survivor-tracking tool developed by Todd Wipke at Santa Cruz. UCOP is currently adapting it for use systemwide. Rob Mann asked if the JBC could reach out to UC Health. The HBAC and all the Medical Center Directors sent a letter to President Drake regarding Navitus.

There was a discussion regarding what campuses can or cannot do with the Redwood/Roots system. Can they reset passwords? What is the difference between reset vs lockout? ROOTS is a subset of Redwood and was developed to give some data access to campuses. Campuses can reset the password if there is not a lockout (too many tries accessing UCRAYS). RASC is contracting with a company called Unify HR which will be able to reset passwords if there is a lockout. A question was posed as to why the campuses can't reset the password, even if there is a lockout. Frank noted that before Redwood, the Health Care Facilitators (HCF) could do the reset.

John noted that there is a greenlight for a retiree committee to work with Cheryl Lloyd and that this committee could perhaps deal systematically with these issues.

There was a discussion about the proposal for more retirement counselors and why they can't be based on the individual campuses instead of being based in Oakland. It appeared that Cheryl seemed to like the Fidelity model of having staff on the campuses for one-on-one meetings. We need to advocate for this. Perhaps the reason for keeping the staff in Oakland is control for accountability. Campuses have done the work effectively in the past.

Vice Chair's Report

Sue Abeles, as Vice Chair, serves as the Chair of the Nominations Committee. The two other members were Jim Dolgonas and Andy Plumley. Because she is on the ballot, she asked Andy to take over the counting of the ballots. He reported that 17 ballots were received and that the election was uncontested and unanimous for those up for election: John Meyer, Chair; Sue Ables, Vice Chair ; Patti Owen, Secretary; and Jack Powazek, JBC Representative. Jack was introduced and made a few comments. John Meyer thanked Joe Lewis for his service as the JBC representative. He has continued to work with RASC and is mentoring the senior managers.

Sue then reported on the CUCRA reserve policy. She thanked the members of the study group: Sue Barnes, Mae Brown, John Dahl, Jim Dolgonas, Jeff Garberson and Eric Vermillion. Their report was sent

to the associations for discussion. The charge to the group was how to use surplus balances. First, they proposed reserves equal to two years of operational expenses, assuming a return to in-person meetings. Once the reserves balances are met, the benefit will first go to CUCRA by 1) mitigating any increase in dues, 2) covering meeting expenses which would also allow sharing the benefit with CUCEA, and 3) providing funds to the associations with the first 50% divided equally amongst the campus with the remaining 50% distributed on a pro rata basis to associations which use the travel program. The timing of any distributions would be after fiscal year end reports.

Bob Daly asked if the funds could go to CUCEA directly. John Dahl responded that the coverage of the meeting costs would be for all three meetings. Jo Anne Boorkman said CUCEA was reimbursed by campus associations and that hybrid costs can't be estimated. John D said that only meeting costs and not travel would be provided for CUCEA. Patti Owen asked if there could be a dues holiday. John D. said no because it is harder to reinstate in the future. Clarification was requested regarding registration fees, which would not be necessary if CUCRA could cover the meeting costs normally paid for by the host campus.

As part of the report, the work group drafted an amendment to the CUCRA Standing Rules to address reserve requirements and use of surplus funds. After discussion, changes were made to paragraph "b" which clarified what the surplus funds could be used for. Paragraph b.) now reads "To cover the meeting expenses of the Fall and Spring joint CUCRA/CUCEA Meetings and the Fall and Spring CUCRA and CUCEA Meetings (including registration fees but not elective costs such as any networking dinner/reception); and,". A copy of the proposed amendment with changes is attached to these minutes.

A motion was made to adopt the proposed amendment with changes. There were no objections.

John Meyer thanked Sue and her committee, especially for having to work under a tight timeline to have the policy in place before year's end.

As a side issue, the committee raised the question of future meetings. Should we return to in person meetings? Is hybrid viable? It is more practical to hold meetings in person. Hybrid is not easy to manage and to estimate how many might be attending in person or via Zoom. Not knowing numbers, there is less leverage for hotel guarantees. The committee proposed that we meet in the Fall in person and via Zoom in the Spring. The benefit to holding the in-person meeting in the Fall is that the content is more robust with elections and the budget. They also suggested that the meeting be held in a central location instead of on or near a campus with nearby public transportation. Oakland was mentioned since UCOP participants would be readily available. This proposal would need to be shared with CUCEA and with the associations.

The discussion included the need to negotiate hotel contracts well in advance which carries a lot of risk to the campus and to CUCRA. People enjoy going to other campuses, and it would be unfair to the Southern California campuses. Sue Abeles noted that they did discuss rotating between north and south. Bob Daly commented he has participated in hybrid meetings that have worked well and that we shouldn't discount them. The issue is the technology availability. Davis has the capability, so why not try it next fall. Gail Harden noted that finding hotels is a lot of work. If the meeting were held in Oakland, who would do the work? Marian wants everyone to keep in mind the ability to travel. John M. wants to get some feedback from the associations regarding the meeting format.

Travel Program

Sue Barnes introduced herself and the 5 travel escorts. The travelers appreciate the escorts. The escorts coordinate pre-travel with the UC participants, provide tour leader support, traveler communication and free-time activity planning.

In 2022 there have been 92 travelers to date, with the numbers varying by location. She estimates income of approximately \$33,000 by the end of the year. For 2023, several of the early trips are full. Travelers are looking for smaller groups; Collette maxes out at 24 and OAT is 16. If a first departure is full, they will try to schedule a second one.

Sue spoke about marketing. She sends a monthly newsletter which has 2100 subscribers; has articles in New Dimension; maintains a website; creates articles for associations and centers; and hosts Zoom meetings. She would like more outreach e.g., flyers at events, published articles, links on association websites, formation of travel interest groups. She will send a flyer.

Numerous issues and comments were shared. Can we ask escorts or campus travelers to report back to the campus? Sue can send out a list of travelers. She also conducts evaluations and can send the results to the associations. Bob asked for trips where one doesn't need to unpack. Sue said that Collette offers Spotlight trips and maybe she can arrange some for 2024. Emeriti are welcome on the trips and information is getting to them through the centers. Escorts receive a complimentary trip. Sue reminded everyone that participants through this program pay the same rate as if they had booked directly through the travel agency; we receive a commission.

Sue asked for any other ideas. How about a panel with one of the panelists being a participant? She responded that if a campus wanted to host a travel tips presentation, they would participate. In response to a further question on how to be a travel escort, Sue noted if enough travelers were interested, we can create a UC group going.

New Member Orientation

Marianne Schnaubelt reminded everyone of the New Member Orientation which was launched last year. They will offer it again a few days before the spring meeting. It lasts about 90 minutes.

Information Officer

Bob Daly, the Information Officer, referred to the retiree report posted on the website. He asked that any comments or suggestions be sent to him. The meeting site has been updated as has the website. He has also helped to update the CUCEA website. John M. asked about the effectiveness of the Retiree Reports. There was agreement that they were useful. Not everyone is getting them, possibly as a result of an out-of-date roster. Bob asked that updates be sent to him.

Financial Matter

Tax Filing Exemption Update

John D. has heard nothing from the IRS since they reinstated CUCRA's tax exempt status. Form 199 has been filed for the past three years. The tax-exempt form has now been filed with the Franchise Tax Board, and a taxpayer number has been assigned. He hopes to hear something by late November or early December. John M. thanked him for his patience and perseverance.

Treasurer's Report

John had the latest Treasurer's Report sent via email through the Information Officer. He wants to highlight two things as of September 30—the cash and investment balances and the commission income. The cash/investment balance totals \$61,677.93. The CD has an interest rate of 2.65%. The commissions from the travel program total \$22,427 through September which is the primary source of income this year. Projecting to the end of the year, the checking and investment accounts combined totals will be \$75,591, and includes \$16,000 from travel commissions. There have been minimal expenses with no officer travel. By the end of the year, there will be a net surplus of \$40,198. Looking at historical data, it is only in the past 3 years where the expenses have not been in deficit. As we resume in-person meetings, expenses will go up. Please keep this in mind as we look at the budget.

According to the By Laws, the 2023 budget must be presented and voted on at the Fall meeting. It is tricky because of the new reserve policy. John developed the budget with the understanding that this policy could or would change the numbers. He followed the membership dues schedule. However, if dues are frozen at the current level the surplus balance is lower. The numbers also reflect the mitigations for Los Alamos and Merced. Expenses are projected based on a Spring Zoom meeting at Santa Barbara and a hybrid meeting at Davis in the Fall. Travel program Income and expenses will net out to about \$24,500. The discretionary expenses total \$4,000--\$2000 for AROHE conference and \$2000 for host campus hybrid costs.

John M. opened the discussion and the first question is whether to freeze dues at current level at \$7249 instead of \$8300. Sue A. proposed keeping dues at the 2022 level since there will be a surplus. Is there a 2022 AROHE conference, and the answer is No. Bob Daly asked for a secondary budget which would reflect the reserve policy. Should the cost for the hybrid meeting at Davis be higher—perhaps \$20,000 instead of \$2000?

John D moved the 2023 budget be accepted with the following changes:

- 1) Freeze dues at \$7249
- 2) Change host campus support to 0
- 3) Remove AROHE charge
- 4) Add hybrid meeting cost at \$15,000

With these changes the budget almost zeroes out. The budget was approved with the changes.

Conversation with Association Presidents

Andy Plumley, President of the Riverside Retirees' Association, was one of the people who raised the issue of having a conversation instead of just updates. He facilitated the discussion and indicated that it would go wherever we wanted it to go.

--President and Vice Presidents and other board members roles and responsibilities

At Riverside, they haven't had a Vice President and their by-laws indicate the VP ascends to the presidency after one year. As a result, their presidents have served long terms. They are thinking of changing the by-laws.

At UCLA, the VP is President-elect. It is a 2-year term and they work together on a transition.

At Davis, they have 2-year terms. They, too, didn't have a VP and the president had to extend their term. The Emeriti Association also has two-year terms, so the two organizations are off-set so there is always a one-year overlap.

Karim Zahedi from Riverside asked each campus to send him a copy of their by-laws since they are currently revising theirs. They are thinking of limiting the nominations of President and VP to past and current board members. It was thought this would be too limiting.

At San Diego, they have one-year terms per their by-laws. The President becomes the past President.

At Irvine, Jill indicated the discussion is helpful and her priority for the next year is to review and update their by-laws. They also want to get a better succession plan in place.

At UCSF, they, too, are redoing their by-laws. They have two-year terms with a maximum of three terms.

At Santa Cruz, they have two-year terms, and the VP ascends to become President. However, they are finding board recruitment difficult.

At Berkeley, the positions have two-year terms. The by-laws indicate the VP ascends to the President, but that did not happen at the last election.

At Santa Barbara, they need succession plans that work. It is hard to find board members. They tried co-presidents and nominating committees, but those didn't work. Rob parenthetically asked if we could have small group discussions at future meetings.

At LBNL, COVID has had an impact on recruiting both officers and new members. They have one-year terms with the 2nd VP ascending to 1st VP and then to President. They are not getting access to new retirees.

PARRA has three-year terms and a 15-member board. They have trouble recruiting Presidents and VPs.

Bob Daly commented that at Riverside, they need longer terms.

UCLA has an enthusiastic 19-member board. They can attract members to committees and then to elected positions.

John M asked if Karim can send the matrix he is developing from the by-laws to the rest of the group.

Sue Barnes said that succession planning was the number one issue of AROHE. It is important to get a committee structure, although it is more work to get the committees organized.

Jill noted that Irvine has a number of groups (e.g., hiking, biking, etc.) with leaders but they don't want to be on the board. She needs more help.

UCR has three standing committees.

Lee Duffus suggests that the ascending President have exposure to CUCRA.

Gail said that UCSF has a lot of clubs. Their program committee offers something once a month, such as visiting a museum. They also have a speakers committee.

Marian noted that Berkeley has a 10-member board, including 6 at large members. Each of them is expected to take on a task such as membership, luncheons, etc. Berkeley also has a Section Club (formerly known as Faculty Wives) which has a large number of special interest groups. UCRAB doesn't want or need to replicate them.

Rob said they had been invited by Berkeley and Davis to Zoom webinars.

Mae commented that committees distribute workload—membership, nominating. Their center director recruits members of the committees.

--Volunteer Recruitment

Andy said that Riverside has started in person gatherings and have tapped folks.

Mae noted that at San Diego, they sponsor Zoom meetings. They have a program called "Coffee with the Board." Each board member wrote to a number of new retirees.

Jill said that at Irvine they host an electronic newsletter. They also have personal outreach to those the board members know who might be retiring. They, too, have an on-line coffee with the board program.

Rob says that Santa Barbara has a Chancellor's reception for new retirees.

Gail said that they have sign up sheets on the tables at their in-person luncheons.

UCLA also has a Chancellor's reception. They have a mentoring program with 11 mentors and 50 participants.

At Santa Cruz, Bill Parro says they have a "welcome to retirement" and is curious what other campuses do.

Diane commented that Davis has a welcome to retirement reception and a retiree resource fair.

Before COVID, Irvine hosted a new retiree social at the pub and paid for food and non-alcoholic drinks. It was relatively inexpensive and very successful.

At LBNL, Nancy reported they have a director's reception for all retirees. It was not successful on Zoom. They are starting to transition back to in-person gatherings.

--Campus Support and partnerships

Andy noted that Riverside has found a physical home.

Emily shared that the Davis associations are under the Alumni Association and they have 3 FTE.

Berkeley has 2 FTE and reports to the Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty. They are losing their current space in order to move faculty into the building due to the pending demolition of a campus building.

Irvine has 6,000 retirees/emeriti. They report to the Alumni and Development Unit. They make an annual report to the campus.

San Diego had a space for the Retiree Association which was torn down. They are spread out with programming and have temporary office space. They report to Human Resources, and their finances come through that budgeting process.

UCLA's RA reports to the Vice Chancellor of Academic Personnel. The Center has 3 FTE

Sue B. said she had developed a spreadsheet for the Retirement Centers regarding FTE, Budget, reporting lines, etc.

There is no center at UCSF and they get their support from the Alumni Center. They have a new retiree celebration with vendors and 14 speakers.

Santa Cruz has a Retirement Center with 1 FTE which reports to University Relations.

Rob noted this discussion structure was great. UCSB is planning a 1-day event in the spring. Sue A. said she prefers a 2-day meeting, and there was agreement that it worked the best.

Jill asked if there are separate newsletters for emeriti and retirees.

Irvine has separate newsletters.

At Berkeley, all announcements/news for both associations are made through the Retirement Center's monthly electronic newsletter. UCRAB has a quarterly newsletter which is distributed through the Center's newsletter.

At UCLA, their center sends out a bi-monthly newsletter. Their RA has a quarterly newsletter that goes out electronically and in paper for those without email addresses. They co-sponsor after-lunch programs 3-6 times per year with the Emeriti Association. Elaine is trying to get the two associations to work together.

At Riverside, both boards met jointly for a while. At one point, Bob tried to create a merger of the two groups with co-presidents, but that didn't happen.

Sue A. commented that it is a lot of work to reach out to the emeriti and that it requires a personal relationship.

Patti noted that Berkeley has an Advisory Board for the Retirement Center which includes representatives from all the affiliated associations, including UCRA and the Emeriti Association.

At San Diego, Mae said that the Retirement Center Director is the glue that holds all retirees together. The President of the Retiree Association is a liaison to the emeriti board. All newsletters are electronic.

At Davis, they have a joint meeting, with about 95% in common and then they split. There is a joint fundraising committee.

Harry Powell said it has been a pleasure working with John and Sue.

Nancy noted that the 4 Berkeley affiliated associations share lectures and have a common health care committee.

John M. thanked Andy for facilitating the discussion. It was helpful comparing strengths and challenges. Should we consider small group discussions in the future? He also thanked Cary and Camille for their meeting support.

Rob reminded everyone that the next meeting will be hosted by Santa Barbara.

John adjourned the meeting at 12:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Patti Owen, Secretary

April 27, 2023

Attachment: Motion to Amend CUCRA Standing Rules

Last Revision: 10/27/2022

Motion to Amend CUCRA Standing Rules to Address Reserve Requirements and Use of Surplus Funds

This motion asks to amend the CUCRA Standing Rules to address reserve requirements and use of surplus funds as follows: CUCRA will seek to maintain a reserve equivalent to two years' worth of operating expenses (Required Reserve Balance) to protect the Association from future downturns in travel program participation, inflationary increases, and unanticipated expenses. The Required Reserve Balance will be adjusted annually. At the end of a fiscal year (December 31), the Treasurer will determine the extent of any remaining surplus funds after the Required Reserve Balance is met and will allocate those funds for the benefit of the CUCRA membership, in the following priority:

- a) To mitigate an increase in dues that might be required in the event that there are increased operational expenses and a projected deficit in the coming year;
- b) To cover the meeting expenses of the Fall and Spring Joint CUCRA/CUCEA Meetings and the Fall and Spring CUCRA and CUCEA Meetings (including registration fees but not elective costs such as any networking dinner/reception); and,
- c) To distribute any remainder after a) and b) have been covered to the member associations using the following formula: 50% will be distributed on an equal share to all member associations and the remaining 50% will be distributed on a pro rata share basis to member associations whose members and guests utilized the travel program during the past fiscal year.

Should the Required Reserve Balance fall below the two years' target, there shall be no distributions until the target is achieved.