# California State University, Los Angeles Emeriti Association

**Emeriti Center, Administration 815**

**California State University, Los Angeles**

**5151 State University Drive**

## Los Angeles, CA 90032

**Minutes of the December Meeting**

**Date:               December 14, 2005**

# Place:              Villa Gardens

### **842 E. Villa Street**

**Pasadena, CA 91101**

**Time:              12:45 - 2:45 p.m.**

**Present:          P. Brier, H. Cadenas, J. Casanova,** **H. Cohen, W. Darrough, D. Dewey, K. Johnson, J. Johnson,** **D. Margaziotis, R. Marshall, L. Mathy, L. Negrete, K. Phillips, V. Potter, L. Schwartz,** **B. Sinclair,** **F. Stahl. W. Taylor**

**Guest: Bob Fowells, B. Kully**

#### Absent:           J. Fisher-Hoult, M. Friedman, H. Goldwhite, J. Hoyt, H. Villarreal

**1.0        Announcements**

Lou said that Janet, Hildebrando and Harold Goldwhite would not be attending. Frieda said that she had materials from Janet to report on. Lou circulated copies of the CSU *Academic Senator* and the newsletter of the UCLA Emeriti Association. He then distributed applications for CSU ERFA and encouraged committee members who are not members of that Association to join.

Don Dewey circulated a Christmas letter from Margaret Hartman. It was announced that Don Moore died on December 6th and that funeral services were being held at the same time as the meeting. Members of the committee reminisced about Don. Lou then welcomed Bob Kully who is now Executive Director of CSU ERFA. Don welcomed Bob Fowells (Music), a guest.

**2.0        Approval of Agenda**

Joe reminded the committee that during the last meeting, it was agreed that there should be a discussion of the possible dues increase while Ken Phillips was present, since he had a long-standing interest in that issue. Joe noted that the matter appeared on the agenda under Unfinished Business as item 5.1. To ensure that Ken could participate in the discussion, Joe suggested that without changing the agenda, we at least begin that discussion during the Fiscal Affairs/Treasurer’s report. It was m/s/p to approve the agenda.

1. **Approval of Minutes of October 10th and November 9th.**

Bill said that Demetrius had passed him a clearer summary of the report he made in October. Bill agreed to make the corrections. The minutes were m/s/p as corrected.

Bill said that the November minutes he circulated were mislabeled as October. He also said that Frieda informed him that he misinterpreted her remarks about the problems with her scholarship. The mistake that was made concerning her scholarship was made in the Office of Institutional Advancement and NOT the Physics Department. Leon also offered corrections. Bill agreed to make the corrections. The November minutes were m/s/p as corrected.

**4.0    Officer and Committee Reports and Recommendations**

**4.1              President:  Louis Negrete**

Lou reported that Joan has developed a draft of an Executive Committee “master calendar” that was suggested at the November meeting. Joan said that she modeled the draft on the meetings and events held in 2006. She requested that members examine the draft and make suggestions. She said that she was particularly anxious to get input from Frieda regarding *Emeritimes* dates and from Janet about those involving scholarships. There was some discussion of the dates that are easily fixed and the ones that change from year to year. Joan asked for feedback.

**4.2              Past President:  Barbara Sinclair**

No report.

**4.3       Vice President - Administration:  Harold Goldwhite**

Not present/no report.

**4.4**     **Vice President - Programs:  Herminia Cadenas**

Herminia reported that the arrangements for the Art Gallery in the Fine Arts Building for the February 13th celebration of Emeriti Week have not been finalized. She has called and gone by to try to reserve the space, but has just been told that there is “no problem.” She will attempt to finalize arrangements when the campus reopens. Frieda suggested that the February Executive Committee meeting be moved to the morning of the 13th, a Tuesday, saving members an extra trip to campus. It was m/s/p to convene the February meeting at 10 am on Tuesday the 13th of February.

**4.5  - 4.6 Fiscal Affairs Chair & Treasurer: Joe Casanova and Bill Taylor**

Joe suggested that since Bill Taylor would have to leave the meeting early due to a prior appointment, his report should be made first. Bill circulated his December report. He said that the only changes since the last report are that $1,165 in dues has been collected and $225 has been contributed to the Fellowship Fund, which brings our saving account balance to $14,855.84. We also collected a dividend of $43.44.

Karen asked if there have been any new developments in Janet’s correspondence about how much money was owed to balance the scholarship fund expenditures. Frieda said that Janet left a bagful of materials that she had not gone through yet. Lou said that he had talked to Janet about two days ago and she told him that the issue had been resolved. She did not tell him how much was owed. Joe said that we do not have a figure, but that Janet implied that the Association had “come out okay.”

Joe then reminded the Committee that at our last meeting we talked about raising dues and that we decided that we needed to know what we were going to do in a more philosophical way in order to decide whether we were going to have a dues increase or not. During that discussion we decided to organize a retreat. Some members recalled that Ken Phillips has long advocated a dues increase, so the decision was made to discuss the matter at this meeting and to further discuss the retreat.

Joe reported that the summary of our budgets for the past eight years showed relatively steady expenditures except on one key item: fellowships. We have been quite purposively dedicating a substantial amount for fellowships. Joe suggested that the time might be ripe to consider raising our dues. At the November meeting, Joe distributed a document that showed how much the Association would accrue by raising the dues by $5 and $10 respectively. He said that there had been no discussion of raising the dues of Life members.

With that background, Joe invited Ken to speak. Ken opened by outlining the procedures that had to be followed to raise dues. First, the Committee had to recommend an increase, then the proposal would have to be announced in the *Emeritimes* and then the membership would vote on the proposal at the Annual Meeting in May. Ken said that the last time we went through this, the Board passed an increase AND it was announced in the *Emeritimes*. Then, when members of the board read the article explaining the increase that had been written by Ken, they decided to withdraw the recommendation and leave the dues as they were at that time.

Ken said that he had been watching the Association for years, and has noticed that we always want to do more good things. He suggested that that was wonderful, but that we should recognize that when we want to do good things, they cost money. His second point was that years ago, when he was president, he talked to Rosie and that she told him that the President might not always support the Association the way he has in the past. When Ken analyzed the savings the Association had in reserve, he found that it would only be able to operate for two to three years without the President’s support before running into real trouble. Ken said that we assume that the current president will continue to support us as he has in the past. We should consider the possibility, however, that this or a future president may withdraw support. Ken suggested that the Association should consider a small raise of $5 or $10 to shield us from such a possibility rather than confronting the membership with a $50 raise of dues if and when we run into trouble.

Frieda argued that any such increase should be announced in the winter issue of *Emeritimes,* rather than the spring issue that would come out just before a vote would be taken. She said that work would begin soon on the winter issue, so that the matter should be resolved today. Joe agreed, noting that we might put off a discussion of mission and methods of increasing membership until the proposed retreat, but should probably act immediately if we intend to attempt to increase dues. Ken said that he thought that there should be an across the board increase of $10. When asked if he also supported a $10 increase for Life Members he said he did, although there was a suggestion of a $50 increase for them.

He then suggested that we have to do a better job of campaigning for new members. Instead of merely inviting new emeriti to join with a notice in the *Emeritimes*, Ken said that we should identify people who might be likely to join and approach them individually and personally invite them to join. He predicted that we would be able to increase membership appreciably.

Don said that more thought should go into the arguments being advanced for a dues increase. He argued that 1) openly stating that we don’t know how long this president or the next will continue supporting us may be an invitation for them to stop and 2) we should be careful about justifying a dues increase as a means to fund scholarships. Of course that is the reason we are running into a problem. However, many members who wish to support the fellowship program are already making contributions to it. Of those who are not contributing, many may not wish to pay increased dues to support the program. Don suggested that we should come up with more compelling arguments if we hope to sway the membership.

Joe agreed with Don and observed that we are not in financial trouble. We have a healthy bank account of about $15,000 and a $10,000 CD. Even if we do run into trouble, we will have enough to run on while going through the process of raising dues.

Bill Taylor noted that the last time a dues increase was advocated and the statement drafted, the Board then reviewed it before being announced to the membership. He argued that there was insufficient time to follow that procedure this time; that any statement written now could not be reviewed before being sent out in the winter *Emeritimes.*

Don added he understood that a main reason for holding the retreat was to discuss the issue: to determine whether we needed more money, how we would justify an increase and discuss how the money would be spent. He agreed with Bill Taylor that it was premature to be deciding on a dues increase prior to the retreat. Frieda said that the most cogent rationale for augmentation IS the fellowship program because students’ expenses have risen drastically so that the money we have been awarding lately covers a smaller fraction of their expenses. Just to “keep faith” with the commitment we made, we need to raise our income.

Demetrius supported a thorough examination of the reasons we use to support a dues increase. He said that he did not think that members or potential members would be convinced that a dues increase was appropriate if the main argument for that increase was to augment the fellowship program. He said that although we may see this as a very noble and worthwhile goal, it will not convince those who are not willing to contribute to the fellowship fund in the first place. He argued that we needed a better, more effective rationale for the increase.

Joe disagreed strongly with the assumption that we cannot convince the membership that scholarships for students are not a good way to spend our money. He said that all of the members of the board decided to spend one $10,000 CD that way. Joe observed, however, that since several members of the committee seemed opposed to proposing a dues increase at the present time, that we should start now planning our strategy for requesting an increase next year after we have had a chance to get together and talk about our philosophy and mission and carefully consider the rationale for this group to support a dues increase.

Frieda observed that regardless of whether the proposal is announced in this or next winter’s *Emeritimes*, and then voted upon the following May, we have to decide whether the increase will go into effect immediately following the vote, or the following year. Joe argued that the increase should go into effect immediately after the vote. He noted that the amount involved was very small. When asked, he said that he also supported an increase for Life Members. He said that he did not know whether an increase of $50 was too much. There was a suggestion of $25 or $20. Frieda said that that last time the committee voted down an increase in annual dues but passed increases of $100 for both Life and Sustaining Life Members.

Demetrius said that he wished to clarify the point he made earlier. He did not think that the committee members needed to be convinced that a dues increase is necessary and that we should spend some of the increased revenue to support scholarships. His point was how do we convince other members and most especially those emeriti who are not members of the Association now. How can we attract more members? Demetrius said that, in fact, he is in favor of increasing dues but he is even more in favor of having a reason or rationale that will sell. Joe argued that the fellowship rationale was quite compelling and said that we would have little difficulty in drafting a persuasive proposal that this is one of the primary kinds of things that the Emeriti Association does on a regular basis to support students. He doubted that the emeriti would turn that back.

Leon said that he doubted that $5 or $10 was going to make a significant difference in whether someone would join the Association or not. He did not think that the careful crafting of a rationale was that important, but if one was used it should be simple and straightforward and one that anyone could understand: the cost of living is going up and you can’t keep the same dues year after year. Harold Cohen made an alternate recommendation, that rather than rush through a dues increase, we become more active in soliciting contributions for fellowships. He suggested that we include a note with each mailing soliciting contributions of $25, $50, $100 or other amounts for the fellowship fund. If we get enough of a response from that, we may not even have to follow through with a dues increase.

Barbara agreed with Leon. There should just be a straightforward statement that increased dues are necessitated by the higher costs. The increase should merely be announced as a simple matter rather than elaborately justified. Frieda pointed out that it was not something that is simply announced, it has to be voted upon an annual meeting.

Don said that no matter what we decide about the dues increase, we should still go ahead with a retreat at which we can discuss the more general issues of mission and membership. He argued that membership was far more important than dues increases. We should be talking about what we are not doing that we should be doing to attract more members. Frieda then spoke in support of Harold Cohen’s recommendation for a separate solicitation for fellowship contributions. We should also remind people that their contributions are tax-deductible. That may make the contribution more attractive.

Demetrius tried to summarize the discussion by suggesting that we need to do three things: 1) mount an independent effort to attract new members, 2) increase the dues by $5 or $10 with a simple announcement in the *Emeritimes* and 3) launch a separate drive specifically for scholarship funds that may allow us to award more money than would be accrued by a simple dues increase.

Joe then asked if it would be appropriate to test the waters with a motion. He moved to propose an increase in dues for both annual memberships by $10. The justification would be a simple statement about rising costs. The increases would be announced in the winter issue of *Emeritimes* and be voted upon at the Annual Meeting in May and take effect in 2007. His motion was m/s/p.

**4.7     Fellowship Fund Chair: Janet Fisher-Hoult**

Frieda reported for Janet. In keeping with Janet’s tradition, Frieda distributed gift gemstones (magnetized Hematites), which Janet had left, to members of the committee. She then circulated a letter that Janet received from a former scholarship winner. Frieda informed Janet that some non-campus friends of Mary Gormly, a couple with some very good connections with organizations in which Mary was active, would be visiting campus on December 26th and that the Gormly exhibit would be left on display so that they could see it. Janet prepared papers on the memorial fellowships and on Mary’s career. Janet and Frieda hope that these organizations will contribute to the Mary Gormly Fellowship and build it toward the necessary $10,000.

Lou said that there were other issues that Janet wanted to raise, but she wanted to do that in person.

**4.6  OLLI:  Peter Brier**

 No report.

**4.7  Historian/Archivist: Leon Schwartz**

 Leon reported that the archives located in the Public Relations Office would remain there rather than being relocated to the basement. He also reported that all folders of emeriti are now in Special Collections in the library rather than divided between Public Relations and Special Collections. This should facilitate access to them for purposes of writing obituaries.

**4.8  Corresponding Secretary: Marilyn Friedman**

Not present/no report.

**4.9 Membership Secretary: Karen Johnson**

 Karen circulated letters that are sent each year soliciting new emeriti to join the Association and members who have not sent in their dues to rejoin. She solicited suggestions for revising the letters. Members offered suggestions regarding revising the text to emphasize the major contributions the Association was making to the university through the fellowship program.

* 1. **Webmaster: Demetrius Margaziotis**

Demetrius said that he was working to update the OLLI page and updating some new database information he received from Harold.

**4.12 Secretary: William Darrough**

No Report

**4.13 Database Coordinator: Harold Cohen**

Harold reported that he gave Karen a copy of the Association database as it stood the day before the meeting and that Joan has the labels for the *Emeritimes* mailing except for one correction he would give her. Harold also said that he became involved in correspondence involving Barbara, Joan and Frieda about the Los Angeles County Commission on Aging survey discussed at the November meeting. He did an Internet search and was able to find a site that listed all 309 LA County Zip Codes. He provided Joan with the information. Joan thanked Harold. The logistics of distributing the blurb on the survey were discussed and it was determined that it could be included in the winter mailing of the *Emeritimes* sent to LA County addresses.

**4.14          *Emeritimes* Editorial Chair: Frieda Stahl**

Frieda said that she would include the notice of the recommendation of a dues increase in the winter *Emeritimes* with notice that it would be voted upon at the Annual Meeting in May. Joe said that he would help with the wording. Don said that it should be phrased as a recommendation by the Executive Committee that would be acted upon by the General Meeting. In addition to the five obituaries she listed at the last meeting, Frieda is working on Don Moore’s. The issue will be a large one, because it will include an article on fellowship winners that was not available in the fall. There are also some fine pictures of the fellowship winners, the reception, and the artwork she will try to fit in.

Joan said that she would solicit volunteers for the *Emeritimes* mailing at the meeting in January.

Demetrius said that, before we changed topics, he wanted to note that the title *Emeritimes* was not unique to the Association, that it was also the title of the U.C. Davis association’s newsletter.

**4.15          CSULA Academic Senate: Don Dewey**

Don reported that the Senate had met once since our last meeting and that Marjorie Bray made a presentation on programs for students abroad. She is the campus representative of the program, and asked faculty to encourage students to apply. There was also an especially interesting presentation by Joseph Aguirre, the director of the student union. He said that they expect to be in parts of the new building by next fall. He said that they were also going to have an eating facility and a shell for musical performances on Greenlee Plaza.

The Senate did pass a policy. The old policy concerning “acceptable employment levels of part-time faculty” was changed to “employment levels of temporary faculty.” The real change is to bring the wording into line with the contract that defines overload for faculty but without specifying any percentage. In effect, you don’t go beyond what is responsible. You have to justify what you do. The main change is that the old 125% allowable for part-time faculty is no longer a limitation on temporary faculty. You have to provide evidence, however, as to what you are doing and someone is going to judge whether that is appropriate or not.

Demetrius added that the 125% limitation does apply to FERP faculty.

**4.16     CSU Academic Senate: Harold Goldwhite**

 Not present/no report.

**4.17     CSU ERFA Council Reps.: Harold Goldwhite, Leon Schwartz, and Barbara Sinclair**

Leon continued his report on the last meeting.

Health Benefits Committee: Chair Milt Dobkin announced that CalPERS members would need to know the percentage of medical expenses that would be covered by Medicare. They should have received a letter from CalPERS in November and a letter from Social Security that should provide them with the necessary information.

As mentioned at the last meeting, the Long Term Care Program is encountering serious difficulties. They will either have to raise rates or change coverage to a specified number of years rather than lifetime coverage. The rate increase under discussion is from 5% to 10%. The Vision Care Program which is being made available to some state retirees is supposed to cost around $13 a month, however the CSU is opposing including retired faculty. The committee deplored the negative attitude of the trustees toward hearing the views of retirees representing the faculty on retirement issues. It was m/s/p that the chair of the Health Benefits Committee express concern to the CSU Trustees regarding their lack of support for benefits for retirees.

Legislative Committee: The good news is that new legislation opposed by CSU ERFA was not supported in the legislature. The two principal pieces of failed legislation were ACA. 23 and AB 1961 both by Keith Richman. Leon circulated copies of the bills so that members could read the text. Unfortunately the legislature did not support legislation that would have increased our benefits.

Grants Committee: The Grants Committee has awarded grant money to two projects: 1) Gene Houser and Gloria Matthews- Computer Access for CSU ERFA retirees in Extended Care and Rehabilitation Facilities and 2) Walter Askin (CSLA) - Compilation of Documents and Publications pertaining to My Vision of the Creative Process. Leon said that further information on these projects can be found in the August issue of the CSU ERFA *Reporter.*

Pre- and Post- Retirement Committee: Chair William Blischke reported on the danger to emeriti of political pressure to end or curtail pensions in the coming years. He sees an intergenerational problem. He thinks that the younger generations think that we are spoiled and that may fuel political pressure to curtail current benefits. He solicited suggestions to the Committee for strategies to defend the status quo. He asked how retirees might do a better job of publicizing their activities and contributions. Leon responded by saying that our organizational websites are very important in this regard.

Liaison to the CSU Academic Senate: Ronald Kroman reported that the Academic Senate passed two resolutions: 1) The CSU needs $690 million over two years for facility repair and 2) The need to review executive compensation by the Chancellor’s Office.

Chancellor’s Committee: Chair Harold Goldwhite reported that the Committee recommended a gifted attorney and former public school teacher as a new Trustee. Leon did not recall the name of the person.

CFA Liaison: Dieter Renning reported that there was an impasse in bargaining. A mediator was hired in October. Administrator benefit packages are out of line with those offered to faculty. The Trustees only gave the faculty representatives two minutes each to make their case. There is concern that the Governor and Trustees may be planning to raise student fees another 10%. CFA has filed a suit challenging the conditions of the Munitz appointment. There was an endorsement by CFA of Angelides for governor. George Diehr was reelected to the Pers Board.

Bob Maurer, the Treasurer, said that he wants a more timely distribution of the Budget Report. It was m/s/p to postpone budget approval until the report was available.

Don added that ACA 23 that would have reintroduced defined contributions as our retirement plan did not even get a second in the legislature. Richman also failed to get enough signatures to get the measure on the ballot. Don also said that nuanced proposals to reform the PERS Long Term Care Program were rejected in favor of 1/3 increase in cost. One proposal was to put a limit on the amount of time spent in a facility. This was rejected in favor of a percentage increase.

**5.0              Unfinished Business**

**5.1 Planning for Retreat to deal with: possible dues increase, reconsideration of mission of the Emeriti Association and strategies for increasing membership: Joe Casanova, Demetrius Margaziotis and Barbara Sinclair.**

Joe said that part of the reason for the retreat has already been dealt with through the earlier vote for a dues increase. He said, however, that he detected a very strong need voiced by members to have a retreat to discuss the philosophy of the organization and where we should be putting our main efforts. Joe suggested that we take the main points of Ken Phillips document and those that come out of Karen’s letter and merge them and treat them as key topics for careful consideration and discussion. Joe said that he would work on the document and suggested that Ken Phillips be invited to participate in the retreat. He then said that we could carry over to the January meeting the planning of the retreat now that the urgency of the dues issue had been resolved by the earlier vote.

Barbara observed that there were a couple of items that came out of the last retreat that should be added to the mix for further discussion. She and Joe agreed to compare notes on the last retreat and to incorporate promising topics into the agenda for the proposed retreat. It was agreed that Joe, Demetrius and Barbara would constitute an organizing committee for the proposed retreat. Ken Phillips then suggested that the retreat could be held at Villa Gardens. Barbara countered that she would miss the view of the water from the Long Beach Yacht Club.

Lou then asked Bob Kully, longtime member of the Emeriti Association and presently Director of CSU ERFA, if he had any observations or comments. Bob said that he had been looking over the letters circulated by Karen Johnson and he felt strongly that they should include a statement that if you are a member of the Cal State LA Emeriti Association, you may have an opportunity to select, or at least advise the representative of this group on the state council of CSU ERFA, the only organization that looks after the CSU pensions, health benefits and dental plans. Bob argued that if we mention these topics we will immediately get the attention of the emeriti. Karen asked Bob to email her some proposed text.

**6.0        New Business**

**6.1 Protocol for dealing with attempts to contact emeriti through the website: Demetrius Margaziotis.**

 Demetrius said that this was a recurring problem that is encountered by him, Harold and Joe: they get an email that someone is looking for a retired faculty member. Our website does not provide contact information except for a limited number of people who have agreed to make it available. My question is: how do we deal with this? Joe said that this very question came to us shortly after the website was created. He said that he was getting emails routed to his address. When he raised the issue at a meeting of the Executive Committee, they agreed that no information would be given out unless a person was contacted and they gave permission. Later the Committee added that anyone who wanted to have their contact information freely available could post it on the website. There was a consensus that messages asking for contact information about an individual should be forwarded to that individual (by email or snailmail) so that (s)he makes decision about whether or not to respond.

**7.0       Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50 p.m.