**Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, **November 9, 2017**

Time: **12:30-2:30 PM**

Place: **SA 110**

Present: S. Burstein, P. Brier, M. Cates, J. Cleman, D. Keane, A. Gonzalez, N. Fabris, S.Felszeghy, K. Reilly, D. Schaeffer, D. Vernon

Absent: J. Fisher-Hoult, J. Galvan, D. Klein, J. Kirchner, D. Margaziotis, B. Sinclair, F. Stahl, B. Taylor

1. Announcements
	1. Stan congratulated Bill and Marty again for their honor at the Distinguished Educator Dinner.
	2. Stan announced that the next meeting will be a luncheon at Villa Gardens on December 14 at 11:30. More details to follow.
	3. Deborah announced that they are looking for a speaker for the Spring luncheon.
	4. Stan will make contacts regarding an obituary for Clem Padick.
2. Approval of Agenda
	1. M/S/P as presented.
	2. Suggestion was made that in the future perhaps some of the new business items be placed first on the agenda as we rarely get to them.

3.0       Approval of the Minutes:

3.1 M/S/P the minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting: October 12, 2017

4.0       Officer and Committee Reports and Recommendations

 4.1 President’s Report

 4.1.1 Stan and John will meet immediately after this meeting with the President, Provost, and Janet Dial regarding the renaming of Lecture Hall 2 for Len Mathy.

 John did talk to Kevin Baaske regarding having the state-wide Senate honor Len in some way.

4.2 Vice President Programs: Deborah Schaeffer

 4.2.1 Deborah thanked everyone for helping with her first luncheon and remarked

that the program did seem to go too long. Discussion followed with ideas that might not involve a speaker: musical presentation, members sharing travel experiences, etc.

4.2.2. The program committee members are Nancy Hunt, Diane Vernon, Marlene Zepeda. Deborah is looking for others who might join.

4.2.3 The following luncheon dates were announced: Spring: April 27, 2018;

Fall: September 14, 2018; Spring: May 3, 2019

4.2.4 It was M/S/P to establish a time certain at the January meeting for discussion and possible action to determine a program to replace a speaker for the Spring luncheon.

4.2.5 John reminded the members that table decorations are temporarily in the President’s office storage and need to be moved.

4.3       Treasurer: Marshall Cates

4.3.1 Marshall distributed the report showing $17,782.77 in the credit union account, with withdrawals totaling $7,030. The UAS account now has $5,000, and the $1,430 pending has now been paid for fellowships to the foundation. There is a balance of $10,042.12 in the FCU savings account. The current balance in the Life Long Learning account is $6,282.05

4.3.2 They are in the process of changing signatories on the accounts to reflect Stan’s name.

4.4 Fiscal Policy Chair: Marshall Cates

 4.4.1 Marshall has distributed 3 W9s for Life Long Learning vendors.

 4.4.2 Although we still have not received the bequest, Marshall was assured that they are still dealing with estate taxes, etc. and if they finish, ½ will probably be available in December and the other ½ in July. The Fiscal committee will consider how to infuse the money into the budget. The amount depends on how much we want to put into the fellowship funds each year.

4.5 Fellowship Chair: Alfredo Gonzalez

 4.5.1 Alfredo was called by the Finance Department inquiring about another $1,000 donation, perhaps leading up to another endowment. $1200 is needed to cover actual donation so Denise in Department is being contacted about possibilities.

 4.5.2 The scholarship Director invited feedback on the Academic Works program which is used for the applications for the scholarships/fellowships. Alfredo, John, Dorothy and Jose (via written notes) met on 11/6 and provided 5 recommendations including rationale for each point (the committee did not discuss the fifth recommendation). These are included here for reference for the whole committee:

**Recommendation 1**

Provide a heading to categorize the “traits” that students are asked to “check” that apply to them. We would suggest the following four categories:

 **Financial Need** (Completed the FAFSA, Will enroll in traditional student teaching for the next academic year, Currently employed part time, A single parent, The sole financial support for my family, An international visa student, Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) Member),

**Academic Achievements** (Enrolled through Early Entrance Program, Honors College Member, Been on the Dean’s List/Graduate Honors)

**Service** (Currently involved ~~with~~ in activities ~~empowering/benefiting~~ that empower/benefit traditionally underrepresented/diverse communities, Currently active in two or more Cal State LA organizations, Have completed at least one semester of service in academic governance

**Other** (Registered with the Cal State Office for Students with Disabilities, Currently employed full time, Currently employed as an elementary or secondary school teacher—**Jose had the preceding two “traits” in the category of financial need, I put them here. Let’s discuss**.)

Text in red, above, is new.

Lined out text is recommended to be deleted.

**Rationale:** Having these “traits” grouped in this way would: 1. help reviewers get a better perspective of the applicant on these important areas, 2. It would serve a trigger for the reviewer to look for details of these “traits” in the students personal statement and other related areas of the application

**Recommendation 2**

Reduce the number of points awarded for the letter of recommendation from 20 to 15. (We did not discuss by what number the points should be reduced nor what to do with the points by which this category would be reduced.)

**Rationale:** While the letter of recommendation can, and should be, very important, the experience of emeriti fellowship reviewers is that the quality of reference letters varies greatly’ sometimes it is not submitted. The large number of points awarded in this category should not be so dependent on the time and effort that a reference is able and/or willing to put into it.

**Recommendation 3**

Directions for the Personal Statement should be revised to read as follows:

Describe your academic/career/life goals. ~~Indicate~~ Describe significant ~~how your~~ past achievements, hardships and/or family influences ~~are related to these goals~~. How, if applicable, have your past achievements, hardships and/or family influences contributed to your academic/career/life goals? Explain how a scholarship/fellowship can help you meet your academic/career/life goals. Upload a word document.

Text in red, above, is new.

Lined out text is recommended to be deleted.

**Rationale:** While we want to know what achievement, hardships and family influences a student has had, we don’t believe that they have necessarily influenced a student’s academic/career/life goals. We believe the suggested wording allows them make the connection between academic/career/life goals *if there is one*, but doesn’t make them feel compelled to make a connection if there isn’t one.

We believe that asking students to explain how a scholarship/fellowship can help them meet their academic/career/life goals.is an important and meaningful question.

**Recommendation 4**

All colleges and departments should be asked by the Office of Student Financial Aid to add a scholarship/fellowship heading on their homepage with a link to the scholarship page of the Office of Student Financial Aid.

**Rationale**: This would be a way of alerting college personnel that the scholarship cycle is open and encourage them to direct students to scholarship opportunities.

**(We did not discuss the following recommendation)**

**Recommendation 5**

That the Office of Student Financial Aid provide all units that award scholarship(s)/fellowship(s) the opportunity to review (they can choose not to) the criteria that is in Academic Works used to identify qualified candidates for their consideration.

 **Rationale.** Units that offer scholarships/fellowships were never provided the opportunity to review the criteria that was entered in Academic Works for consistency with what is on the hardcopies from which it was taken. They should be afforded this opportunity.

 4.5.3 John raised the issue of the need to get more people involved in reading the applications, perhaps especially the newcomers to the association. The process of reading is easy (on-line, only one orientation meeting). It was recommended that we read the names of the reviewers at the award ceremony.

4.6 Academic Senate: John Cleman

 4.6.1 John reported that his amendment to the proposed new Senate constitution was accepted. This involved permitting an emeriti person to come as a substitute for one or two meetings without being designated as an alternate. It was decided that there would be two emeriti member representatives and no alternates. Marshall volunteered to be the second representative.

 4.6.2 Other aspects of the constitution revision were discussed ( Provost to have one vote, lecturers represented from each college, etc.). Town hall meetings discussing the proposed revisions are on-going.

4.7 CSU-ERFA: Stanley Burstein, John Cleman

 4.7.1 The agenda from the last meeting was reviewed, including reports on health benefits and the issue of declining membership. It seems different chapters have different rules about who is eligible to join. Any changes would have to involve changes in ERFA bylaws.

 4.7.2 Some discussion about whether a campus should place a flag at half-mast for a deceased faculty member. Our campus and others do not have this practice.

5.0 Old Business

5.1 Measures to stimulate interest in the Emeriti Biographies Project

 5.1.1 Discussion ensued about how to increase interest in this – revise the

 template? Put article in *Emeritimes*? It was M/S/P to have an

 article and also include a separate flyer in the edition, describing the purpose of the project and encouraging people to submit.

 John volunteered to write the article. Not clear about who would create the flyer. It was also discussed to randomly select two people who submitted and award them free

 lunches at a subsequent emeriti luncheon, but this was not passed.

5.1.2 As an aside to discussion of the *Emeritimes,* it was M/S/P to review how each edition is produced, in terms of who reviews the drafts, chooses articles, etc. It was pointed out that the editorial board determines policy and is not involved in the actual production.

5.2 Role of the Association and the Executive Committee in supporting LLL

 5.2.1 This item was removed from the agenda as is has been discussed

 previously.

5.3 Emeriti Involvement in Campus Address to Student Homelessness and Undernourishment – no discussion

6.0 New Business- no discussion

 6.1 Committee Officers who need to be replaced

6.2 Fellowship Criteria

6.3 Assignments for At-Large Members

6.4 Maintenance of Archives

7.0 Adjournment

 7.1 The meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Submitted by Kathy Reilly