

**GA-HERO Long-Term Planning Meeting
January 8, 2015**

Emory University Emeritus College – Luce Center
825 Houston Mill Road, NE, Atlanta, GA 30329

Present: John Bugge (Emory University), Missy Cody (GA State University), Dave Ewert (GA State University), Harry Dangel (GA State University), Ian Gatland (GA Tech), Dennis Marks (Valdosta State University – via phone), Bob McDonough (GA Perimeter), Carol Pope (Kennesaw State University), Anne Richards (University of West Georgia) Brahm Verma (University of GA), Martha Wicker (Clayton State University), Dorothy Zinsmeister (Kennesaw State University).

John Bugge, a co-founder of the Emeritus College, welcomed the group to Emory and explained that lunch would be provided to those in attendance (sandwich, cookie, chips, soft drinks, water, and coffee). The agenda, which had been created by John Bugge, Dave Ewert, and Dorothy Zinsmeister and distributed in advance on line, was reviewed.

The first item on the agenda was a discussion regarding the relationship between GA-HERO and the new University System of Georgia Retiree Council. Will the two entities be parallel, complementary, redundant, synergistic? What roles would GA-HERO play in light of the organization of this council? Where are the overlaps seen? What will remain for GA-HERO to do once the USGRC gets up and running? A comparison/contrast handout was discussed as a point of departure. It read as follows:

RETIREE COUNCIL	GA-HERO
Help start new retirement organizations (RO's) in Georgia System	Help start new retirement organizations (RO's) in Georgia, aid in gaining administrative support, campus recognition
Coordinate a System-wide retiree workforce registry for various academic functions, e.g., online teaching, interim staff positions, etc.	Aid each GA-HERO member RO with outreach to their prospective retirees, retirement coaching, and so on.
Members to serve in advisory roles on System matters, e.g., health insurance.	Share best practices in programming across the spectrum of GA-HERO organizations
Retiree Council members serving <i>ex officio</i> on Faculty and Staff Councils	Share strategies for advocacy on behalf of campus retirees, e.g., on fringe benefits, etc.
Create a plan for each school's reasonable representation on the Retiree Council.	

Confusion about the role each of the above organizations might take in support of retiree issues now exists. In the discussion that encompassed a review of the above, the following perspectives emerged:

- (1) The USG Retiree Council will be comprised of the public/state institutions of higher education in the University System of Georgia. GA-HERO is comprised of both public and private institutions of higher education in the state of Georgia.
- (2) Dave Ewert explained the three types of retiree organizations that are commonly found in the country:
 - a. A "regular" association that primarily arranges social gatherings of retirees and deals with issues like parking, library privileges, etc.
 - b. A "retirement center" (which exists in a few schools around the state) that has actual offices (such as at Emory University, Kennesaw State University, University of Georgia and Columbus State University) and is often referred to as an Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI).
 - c. An "Emeritus College." Four are in existence in the country. These have academic budgets, promote scholarships, maintain a journal, etc. Arizona State University has all three.

He also mentioned consortiums that predate the organization known as AROHE (Association of Retired Organizations in Higher Education). The big ten schools have had such consortiums in place for nearly 30 years. AROHE came into being in 2000 to advocate for, educate, and serve organizations of retirees in the US. It meets every other year. Similar organizations exist in Canada. AROHE is focused on those who serve as managers of retiree organizations. It offers programs that help these associations of retirees grow. Dave explained that he and John Bugge had met at an AROHE meeting and began

exploring the formation of a GA “chapter” of AROHE. The GA-HERO group currently includes both public and private institutions. Few schools in Georgia send representatives to AROHE meetings. An organization known as NORCAL (in northern California) is primarily for directors of retirement centers. Dorothy Zinsmeister, one of the prime movers in creating the University System of Georgia Retiree Council, is also active in AROHE.

Ian asked what the relationship was between the Retiree Council and the Board of Regents.

Dorothy: Chancellor Huckaby is interested in learning more about what retirees are doing. He was invited to one of the meetings of the GA-HERO group. To facilitate his attendance, this meeting was hosted at the Board office about a year ago. Marion Fedrick, Vice Chair of Human Resources, is very interested in the activities of the GA-HERO group. In this context, the time seemed ripe to talk about some type of retiree organization at the system level. Marion Fedrick is a “huge champion” of the council. She is aware that policy is being made at the Board office level regarding retiree health insurance, yet the only retiree on the committee dealing with these issues is Valerie Hepburn, former President of Coastal Georgia College. Hepburn is a retiree but not a member of any retiree association. She sits on the committee dealing with these issues because of her background in healthcare.

Missy Cody explained that Hepburn was at GA State University for 5 years, when the Public Health program was started. She was an associate dean before the program was housed in a separate school and prior to going to Coastal Georgia. She accomplished a LOT at Coastal – transforming programs and contributing to the development of a very “dynamic” campus.

Dorothy explained that she thought retirees should serve on a committee that spoke for retirees, so she put together a proposal based on the fact that Board Policy already contains provisions for the existence of Faculty and Staff councils. It contained some ideas for the role and function of such a committee. Linda Noble is the BOR representative on the Faculty Council. Marion Fedrick is the BOR representative on the Staff Council.

Currently, the retiree council is conceived of as an advisory committee and it is not incorporated in some sort of Board policy. Linda Noble encountered some pushback from the VPAA’s when the Faculty Council was instituted. Especially for smaller institutions, such councils can represent a significant expense. The USG already has many other advisory committees (perhaps as many as 30-40) and if every institution is expected to be represented on each of these, expenses arise for such things as travel, lodging, food, etc. There was reluctance on the part of smaller institutions to add to the already large number of existing committees requiring representation, but the Faculty Council was eventually created. The Board has not yet approved the creation of the USG Retiree Council, but it has been approved as an advisory committee by Chancellor Huckaby. He has been welcoming of its creation and has encouraged those planning its development to move ahead with implementation. There are no plans currently in either Academic Affairs or Human Resources to push for asking the Chancellor to have this retiree council established in policy as the Faculty and Staff Councils already are. Because of this, currently, the existence of the Retiree Council is not assured beyond the time Huckaby serves as Chancellor.

John Bugge asked for additional clarification of what the Retiree Council would be doing. Dorothy explained that more information about this will soon be posted on the USG website, in the section that already contains information about all the other existing advisory committees. Minutes of retiree council meetings will be there. The letter from the Chancellor encouraging its creation will be there. Bylaws will be there once approved [they are currently still under construction]. The role and function of the committee is currently being discussed as part of the development of the bylaws. While the expectation is that all institutions in the University System of GA will be represented on this council, there are some institutions in the state that are too young to have many retirees (e.g., Coastal Georgia, Georgia Gwinnett). Dorothy noted that she has been invited to various institutions to talk to them about establishing a retiree organization.

So far as the second item listed for the Retiree Council is concerned (coordinating a systemwide retiree workforce registry), this has been proposed because several institutions are having a difficult time financially, but still have needs to recruit persons to teach in their programs or to serve in temporary capacities until a search process can be undertaken for particular administrators. A similar national registry already exists, Dorothy explained, thru such organizations as AACSU, and the former AHE. Retirees can choose how long they wish to remain on such a registry and can announce their availability for various positions. They may have to agree to move if they take a particular position.

Dorothy noted that it is expected someone on the retiree council will serve in an ex-officio capacity on the Faculty Council and someone will serve in an ex-officio capacity on the Staff Council. The council is also being proposed to assist the system office in thinking about phased retirement options. Currently, no institution in the system has such options in place. But they can be very facilitative in helping faculty prepare for retirement in terms of what it might be like, when they can afford to move into it, etc. There are some plans where faculty are paid full salary but have reduced loads to experiment with retirement. The same options do not occur for staff.

John Bugge asked if the phased retirement issue was being raised because faculty are thought to “hang on too long” in the positions they currently hold. [See, for example, articles in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* – Fendrich, Laurie (2014, November 14), “The Forever Professors;” or Barnes, Sue, Brown, Janette, and Perlmutter, David D. (2014, November 24), “Dignity in Retirement is Not Too Much to Ask.”] Dorothy said she thought departments should be thinking about some of these issues if they haven’t hired anyone in the last 8-10 years. The aim is not to force anyone out, but to think about the professionalism of the faculty on campus and ask questions relevant to their particular contributions to their institutions, colleges, and degree programs.

Missy Code pointed out that such questions might not necessarily be related to the age or longevity of faculty. Dorothy agreed.

Brahm Verma noted that many faculty wish to retire, but don’t have the financial means to do so. They could be assisted by a transition program based on best practices for providing them with the security to retire. He also mentioned the importance of developing the resources to help with such transitions.

Someone mentioned that a Board policy could be formed in a generic way that would call upon campuses to develop their own policies for phased retirement options. Almost always policies that have wide academic influence involve the VPAA’s talking about what a generic policy should be. There is always someone from the system office involved in such discussions as well. Once policy is reviewed at the System office, it goes to the Board. If it affects students, someone from Student Affairs at the Board level is also present for the development and discussion of such policy.

Martha asked if other states were doing something along the lines of phased retirements. Dorothy said this was happening in other states and Appalachian State had a particularly interesting approach.

Brahm Verma stated that a phased retirement process was a lot more humane and appealing.

Missy mentioned that her husband is at Emory at Oxford and is now handling some specialized duties in preparation for his retirement in December of 2015. Emory has created several individualized plans along these lines as a way of encouraging some retirements.

Ian said he taught at Georgia Tech, then retired, but was invited back. Last year he completed his 50th year of teaching there. He now wonders if there are any other schools that might like to take advantage of his services. It was also noted that Ward Winer is now the new chair of the Silver Jackets (retiree organization) at GA Tech. And Len Parsons is the new VP. Andy Smith is the GA Tech representative to the retiree council.

John Bugge said he thought it was good to have an established group that could provide advice and counsel to those planning to retire and clarify what the group is prepared to do for retirees. He asked if the statements that described GA-HERO (on the document provided above – page 1) would cancel out or be redundant so far as the Retiree Council is concerned. What would there be left for the GA Retiree Council to do?

Anne Richards said she thought of the GA-HERO group as analogous to the functioning of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) on a campus. It wouldn’t take the place of the established governance system, but could serve an advocacy role by providing information about best practices, offering trainings, and recommending policy/procedural changes. Someone mentioned that AARP serves a similar role. Missy agreed and said these wouldn’t be viable roles for the Retiree Council. In addition, the GA-HERO group could bring in the experience and expertise of private institutions in the state, such as Agnes Scott, Oglethorpe, Berry, Mercer. Retirees at these institutions face most of the same issues as faculty in public institutions. John Bugge agreed that the business of “best practices” is what GA-HERO can do very well. Missy noted that Dave Ewert has also sent out ideas for retirement organizations that are as applicable for individuals as for associations of retirees on given campuses. Some faculty move after retirement and may want to affiliate with retiree organizations at other institutions.

Questions then arose as to who takes responsibility for an institutional membership in AROHE. And who for an individual membership to GA-HERO? Georgia State, for example, is an institutional member of AROHE and GA-HERO.

John Bugge mentioned that persons could join GA-HERO as either institutions or individuals.

Martha Wicker asked for further clarification of the differences between the USGRC and GA-HERO, commenting that the advocacy mission was #1 on the minds of those in the retiree association at Clayton State.

Dorothy stated that there are some things for which the Council will serve in an advocacy role, but not many. She mentioned attending a BOR meeting yesterday. Marion Fedrick was talking about a committee that is part of the BOR Personnel and Benefits Committee. It has a subcommittee of people who talk about insurance. A number of Board members are on that committee. A number are from the System office. A number are from outside, e.g., Valerie Hepburn. There were talking about naming another retiree to that committee. Someone had volunteered. Dorothy said she recommended that if a person was named to this committee, it

ought to be worked through the Council. It doesn't have to be a Council member, but the role of the council would include making the recommendation. All agreed on this.

A question that emerged is: should the retiree named to such a committee be someone who knows nothing about insurance, or someone who deals with it as part of what he or she teaches, or someone involved with health insurance issues, navigators, etc.? There's a place for all of the above, but only one representative will be chosen. The USGRC will establish a communication line once it's up and running. It is not yet established, however, and is still shaping itself.

Brahm Verma asked what kind of advocacy GA-HERO might do that the Council would not.

Missy Cody reminded him that GA-HERO involves private as well as public institutions.

John Bugge mentioned that at Emory, a retiree might lose access to software upon retirement. In a particular case he was aware of, it cost the retiree \$5,000 to buy that software. The retiree group at Emory negotiated to get her an exemption from the policy. It might be possible to advocate for getting this possibility for all retirees who could utilize it to continue professional work. The recommendation that all faculty retirees have access to software would not be likely to be dealt with by the USGRC.

Dorothy mentioned that the Council would likely say that such a matter would be an institutional decision. An individual associated with GA Hero might have experience in obtaining this benefit.

Martha mentioned a situation in which the Legislature wanted to do away with cost of living raises for retirees. Retirees brought information back that prevented that legislation from going forward. She asked, which group would have that role in the future: The USGRC or GA-HERO?

Dorothy said that GA-HERO could step in, but in the case Martha was referring to, the president of UGA, Michael Adams, made the primary pitch to the Legislature. That led to a turning point.

Brahm Verma said he wanted to get back to the policy issues that the Council might address.

Dorothy explained that retiree benefits vary a lot from campus to campus. At Kennesaw, retirees (who pay a \$20 fee to belong to the retiree organization) get "free parking," discounts at the bookstore, continued use of the library, access to the Fitness Center, discounts on tickets to performances, and a campus ID card. Some institutions provide research space for retirees. Others do not. This can be negotiated at some institutions, but it would probably not be put into policy form as a guarantee. Instead, policy might read something like, "if space and resources are available," Because Kennesaw State University now has institutional aspirations that go beyond those it held in the past, there is a lot of encouragement and support for faculty becoming more productive in research. Anne mentioned that retirees at the University of West Georgia currently get benefits like free parking without paying any fee for membership in the retiree association, but that, after 10 years of being in existence, the group was recently informed that it would have to find ways of paying on its own for the reception for new retirees that the Development and Alumni Relations office on campus funded in the past.

John Bugge pointed out that GA-HERO is a source of information to all faculty on benefits and how to negotiate with regard to them upon retirement.

Harry Dangel stated that he was most comfortable thinking about the GA-HERO group as an extension of AROHE. As he saw it, the group would do well to focus on best practices, making grassroots connections, finding better ways to communicate with its membership, and considering the possibility of joint programming. What the Emory group is doing, for example, might appeal to others in the metro area. Too many function in "silos" in their institutions. They can get beyond this in a group such as GA-HERO.

Ian mentioned that GA-HERO could encourage the formation of "hobby groups." He, for example, would be interested in one on "celestial mechanics." Dennis Marks expressed a willingness to join such a group.

Brahm Verma said he was still having difficulty determining the unique roles both the USGRC and GA-HERO will play.

John Bugge mentioned that a GA-HERO meeting could easily be facilitated in metro Atlanta because there were so many institutions in that area.

Dave Ewert said there is so much to do for retirees that he and others associated with GA-HERO have strongly backed the creation of the USGRC. He thought there was more to be done for retirees than either of the two entities can do on their own. Such questions as the following emerge: What resources does each group have? What resources can each acquire? What can one do that the other can't? He thought the workforce registry would be best set up by the USGRC. GA-HERO, on the other hand, would likely be able to recruit more members.

The second item on the agenda was the GA-HERO website, including such issues as what additional content was wanted on it, what additional design features would be appealing, and how it could be funded.

Carol Pope, who agreed to set up the website for GA-HERO said she considered what she has created as a “starting point.” [The url for the site is GA-HERO.org]. She asked if others had looked at it and had suggestions for other things they wanted on it. What are we going to do with this method of communication? Does the group want a FACEBOOK page linked to the present website, for example? It was agreed that a Website Advisory Group should be set up to develop guidelines and policies for answering such questions and making recommendations to the larger group. It was agreed that their responsibilities in this regard could be handled via email.

Carol explained that the current design for the website is rather basic; it was developed from a free template made available by WordPress. Carol said she was not a graphic designer and thought the website still needs a more “catchy” look to it.

She also mentioned that there is a cost for the website. It is not free to set up or to maintain. It costs \$90/year for hosting and the domain name. A plan has to be set up to pay for this.

John and Dave said they were overwhelmed and impressed by all Carol had accomplished in such a short time, but agreed that a plan had to be devised to pay for its continuation and maintenance in the future.

Bob McDonough said he had \$80 that had been raised at the last GA-HERO meeting to put toward the web page and asked whom the money should be given to for this purpose.

Dave asked if those around the table knew of resources we might turn to for getting faculty/student help in setting up whatever design elements were preferable for the site.

Martha said she was formerly webmaster for an organization and arranged for someone associated with the Graphic Arts program at UGA to set this up. She just maintained the site after someone else brought it into being. She said it was created free as a student project and was done in such a way that it could easily be maintained. She recommended the same be done for the GA-HERO website.

Brahm Verma mentioned that Scott Schamp, the Director of the New Media Institute at UGA could help with this – and Martha said this was the person who had been so helpful for her in the past. Director Schamp could handle the look of the site while members of GA-HERO could concentrate on the content to be publicized on it. Carol offered to check on this but Dave reported that a request has already been made with the Graphic Arts faculty at Georgia State University and he is awaiting a reply. As a consequence, he said he would appreciate it if Carol would hold off on approaching Schamp at UGA until we hear back from Georgia State University.

Missy said she would like to see a really good calendar on the site, one that would enable persons to input a lot of pertinent information with just one click (such as what a particular activity is, where it will be held, where people attending it would park, what the best directions are to get there, and how someone can respond if he/she plans to attend). Martha mentioned that it would be helpful to automate the calendar in such a way that others could contribute to it if they had a designated password to do so.

Other questions: what other retiree websites should the GA-HERO website have links to? Should there be a members page – containing contact information - for example? Should the calendar focus only on GA-HERO events, or other events of interest to retirees? Missy mentioned that Emory organizes a luncheon, GSU has an author series. Persons who might be planning to travel to a given part of Georgia might be interested in knowing what is happening in that area. John Bugge mentioned that, most essential, was to have a means of communicating with those who are part of GA-HERO.

Anne said she had not yet seen the website, but a fellow retiree told her that today’s meeting had not been posted on the website. Anne asked whether that meant the website currently has no calendar at all. Carol said she intentionally did not post anything about today’s meeting on the website because she understood it was going to involve a smaller group of persons who had knowledge of both the plans for the Retiree Council and the history of the GA-HERO organization. She said, however, that Anne’s question raised a key issue that has been a concern of hers: “What do we want to communicate, or not communicate, on this website?” “What would be most beneficial to retirees?” She said we needed some sort of editorial policy and a group to review various questions that arise so far as what gets posted on the site. The group has to have permission, for example, to post pictures of any individual on the website.

Missy mentioned that, as an active faculty member, she could deduct a lot of professional expenses on her taxes. When she retires completely, however, none of these expenses will be tax deductible. She thought it would be helpful, along with the editorial piece, to have suggestions from an accountant about how to handle such matters for tax purposes. In her own case, a recommendation was made to shift post-retirement expenses from professional development to contributions. Additionally, if an organization is a 501(c)(3), a person can deduct travel to such a meeting.

Carol asked if she should send out an email to find those who might be willing to work on a committee to sort out editorial policy for the website. John Bugge volunteered to serve on such a committee, with the aim of bringing recommendations back to the group as a whole. Dave asked if others around the table wished to volunteer and Ian Gatland said he did, in part because he has found that many websites have too much on the screen.

Continuing to discuss information others thought would be helpful on the website, Martha said she thought it would be helpful to post best practices in various areas and have the ability to post things each campus is doing – such as a retiree breakfast, who the contact person is setting it up, and perhaps even offer a blog about these activities. Carol mentioned that the news page on the current website is actually a blog. She asked if anyone had signed up for this. Learning that no one in the room had done so, except perhaps Dave Ewert, Carol said she would send an email out to better inform persons about the existence of the blog.

Dorothy asked if articles currently posted on the website were in the public domain because some articles are only supposed to be accessible if one has a subscription to the publication that originally printed them. Sometimes, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* has a place one can click on in order to share a given article. Sometimes, this is not possible, however. Carol reported that the articles currently on the site are in the public domain. John Bugge mentioned that these were the kinds of issues that could be ironed out in the advisory committee being formed.

Dave Ewert suggested it would be helpful to have an inventory of resources that could be used to assist us on a voluntary basis in developing this website, e.g., graphic artists, persons who could assist us with pictures, etc. Because there's a lot to be done right now, he expressed the hope that the possibilities of working with UGA would be explored "full speed."

BREAK FOR LUNCH

Discussion of legal incorporation of GA-HERO: rationale, process, costs, funding.

In advance of today's meeting, those assembled had received a memorandum from L. Lynn Hogue, Professor of Law, Emeritus, Georgia State University College of Law, regarding "Incorporation of GA-HERO."

The memorandum began with some of Professor Hogue's questions about the potential overlap in roles between the USGRC and GA-HERO and suggested it might "be wise to proceed with due deliberation until more is known about" the extensiveness and effectiveness of the USGRC as well as its potential relationship to AROHE. He pointed out that any university system program would not affect private institutions of higher education in the state while GA-HERO could be of value to them and he stated that he thought it "important to consider the role and function of GA-HERO, at least initially, in a way that is separate from a commitment to a particular institutional structure, particularly a legal structure such as a corporation."

Dave explained that he had spoken to Lynn earlier in the day and, following a discussion that addressed his questions and concerns, Lynn told him his hesitation was resolved and he believed we were ready to pursue incorporation of GA-HERO. Dave said, however, that he mentioned that he himself did not see it as urgent that we do so, and Lynn agreed.

Lynn's memorandum further outlined "in broad terms" what "will be required to incorporate GA-HERO under state law and to obtain tax exempt status for it from the IRS." He noted that both incorporation and the maintenance of tax-exempt status, once obtained, "impose accounting and reporting requirements on GA-HERO."

So far as incorporation is concerned, he reported that the principal steps required under Georgia law are as follows:

A legal home for the corporation has to be identified. This requires an actual street address for the registered office of GA-HERO and an individual identified at that address to serve as the registered agent of the corporation. This can be changed at a later time (for a fee).

Three persons to serve as the initial incorporators whose addresses are identified.

A simple set of "Articles of Incorporation" that can later transition to the bylaws already worked out which provide for GA-HERO as a non-profit corporation governed by a Board of Directors.

Nominal costs for the above steps are as follows:

:

\$ 25.00 to reserve the name of the corporation prior to filing;
\$100.00 to file for incorporation;
\$ 40.00 to publish notice of intent to incorporate.
\$165.00 total

Once GA-HERO is incorporated, tax-exempt or 501(c)(3) status can be sought from the IRS. Cost for this is \$400 for an application fee, assuming GA-HERO doesn't have annual gross receipts in excess of \$10,000 during its first four years of existence. [Otherwise, the fee is \$850.] Professor Hogue also pointed out that "[t]he importance of tax exemption relates principally to the need

for donations to GA-HERO to be tax-exempt. . . . If . . . the primary operating funds going forward come from institutional contributions, the importance of tax-exempt status may not be as important.”

All fees mentioned above are due to the State of Georgia or the US Treasury and Professor Hogue agreed to handle this pro bono, without charging anything for his time and effort. Because he has no legal trust account, however, and never handles funds for clients he has as a licensed Georgia attorney, someone else (as a treasurer, for example) will be expected to take responsibility for submitting appropriate fees.

A lengthy discussion then took place about this memorandum and about the possibility of incorporating GA-HERO.

Dave Ewert pointed out that the big ten schools have a consortium and emphasize that each school should have a plan for management succession of their retiree organization. AROHE is incorporated and is also a not-for-profit organization. He reported that it is customary for important entities to get incorporated.

Carol explained that she was involved in securing incorporation for a disability services organization in the past. The group initially formed a state organization and then wanted to formalize its structure. Having 501(c)(3) status allowed the group to charge fees for membership. Institutions would only pay for membership to an organization, not to individuals. With the help of an attorney, Carol filled out all the papers to incorporate the group. The group had to have a permanent address, a lawyer to sign off on papers, bylaws, a Board of Directors. There are federal reporting requirements every year, although if you deal with less than \$10,000 annually you just send in a form. A Treasurer who keeps good records is needed. The group has to re-register with the Secretary of State in Georgia every year and you pay a fee if you forget to do this. The annual cost for re-registering an incorporation is \$35.

Dave Ewert said he thought the \$165 is a minimal hurdle and that to proceed with incorporating is the responsible thing to do as an organization as it which would help us sustain the organization over time, He said he thought if we approached TIAA-CREF to sponsor some of our programs, for example, it would be best if we were incorporated. He thought the group already had three persons willing to provide their names as initial incorporators (himself, John Bugge, and Dorothy Zinsmeister). Why not do it seemed to be the sense of the meeting at this point.

Ian Gatland said he was Treasurer of a 501(c)(3) organization that involved millions of dollars, and he was willing to help GA-HERO in a similar capacity.

John Bugge noted that, to take the first step to incorporate, the group had to have a President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, as well as Board members.

Dorothy Zinsmeister asked if the group meeting today was going to make a decision about incorporation, or was a planning group that was going to bring the question to the GA-HERO group when it meets in April. Dave explained that those with authority to vote on the matter had to be members of AROHE and that only about ½ a dozen institutions qualified in this regard, (e.g., Emory, GA Perimeter, GA State, GA Tech, Kennesaw State University, University of West Georgia, Valdosta State University).

John Bugge then asked if the will of the group was to bring a resolution for incorporation to the April meeting. It was noted that at least one person who couldn't attend today's planning meeting (Ann Satterfield, previous president of GA Tech's Silver Jackets) said she wouldn't approve pursuing either incorporation or tax-exempt status for GA-HERO.

Dennis Marks mentioned that reporting requirements for incorporated organizations “can become onerous” in his experience. He was involved with a political organization of volunteers and there were also “ethics” reporting requirements associated with their incorporated status. It was also pointed out by Ian that 501(c)(3) organizations have to be careful about advocacy. It is allowed for an organization to serve in an advocacy role for its membership if it is 501(c)(5), but not 501(c)(3). Given that GA-HERO had been discussed as having a distinct advocacy role, this seemed problematic for its ability to serve in this role.

Bob McDonough reported that he had collected \$80 at the last meeting from the sale of sandwiches to attendees and this could be used toward the annual fee for incorporation. Instead of asking persons associated with the organization to pay dues, money could be made on lunches at meetings.

Dave said he thought it more appropriate to worry about dues and patrons down the road rather than now.

Bob explained that the retiree organization at GA Perimeter has close ties with the Foundation there, in part because the retirees raised \$25,000 for a scholarship. He thought money could come from GA Perimeter as a result to support GA-HERO.

Dennis asked what kind of organization we are and how we might be expected to support ourselves. He said it took him quite some doing for Valdosta to become a member of AROHE and he expected it might take a lot of effort to secure adequate funding for GA-HERO.

John Bugge suggested GA-HERO proceed “conservatively,” so far as funding is concerned at this point, and do so by asking for excess contributions for lunches provided at our meetings.

Brahm Verma asked if someone would clarify for him how GA-HERO would benefit members of the retiree group at the University of Georgia. He said that things were not very clear to him at this point about the different contributions the USGRC and GA-HERO might make and, as a result, he would find it difficult to make the case to the UGA retiree association to support GA-HERO financially. He said he thought it might be best to have the Council move forward first and see what it was going to do for retirees.

Dave asked the group to think about the following question: If \$100 per year were to be collected from each institution that is a member of GA-HERO, what would be done with the money beyond pursuing the possibility of incorporation and 501(c)(3) status? The main function of GA-HERO at this point is organizing meetings, and these are currently self-supporting.

Dorothy said she thought it best to wait for the Retiree Council to shape itself and then think about what we in GA-HERO might want to do, and then formalize whatever that is.

A discussion took place regarding \$90 owed to Carol for the work she has already done in setting up the GA-HERO website. Dorothy said it would be helpful if the GA-HERO group clarified its definition of a qualified voting member for making decisions related to its existence and future plans.

Anne mentioned that an email could be sent out from GA-HERO describing what the organization is considering doing, asking if persons are members of AROHE and whether they are supportive of incorporation for GA-HERO.

Dorothy said she didn't think we were ready for that step as yet because persons getting the email wouldn't know what we have come to understand because they haven't been present for today's discussion and because they didn't get the information sent out to us in advance of today's meeting.

Brahm Verma said he thought it best to let the Retirement Council mature a bit and then identify what needs are not being met by it (such as the fact that private institutions in the state are not included). That would enable us to better define what GA-HERO is or can be about. He thought the \$165 for incorporation costs could easily be raised but the most important first step is determining what needs of retirees GA-HERO is best able to address.

John Bugge asked if the sense of the group at this point in the discussion was to table incorporation for now.

Ian said he wanted to talk with others first at the Silver Jackets meeting.

Brahm Verma said he was going to talk to the UGA group about what unique needs of retirees were not going to be met by the USGRC.

John Bugge said he thought all of us present for today's meeting had learned more about what we need to know before going ahead as a GA-HERO organization.

Dave Ewert noted that the more experience people have with AROHE, the more they will understand what GA-HERO can offer retirees. If funding for GA-HERO came primarily from donations, he thought it would be hard for others to grasp the value of services and ideas that can be gotten from AROHE. Fewer than 100 are currently members of AROHE around the country. GA-HERO is part of the effort to manage the transition into retirement.

The issue of how to pay Carol was raised again. It was moved and seconded to charge a couple of dollars extra for today's lunch, to pool this money and any donations persons were willing to offer with the \$80 collected by Bob McDonough, and to give this money to Carol. This was agreed to by consensus and monies collected were given to Carol.

Setting the Agenda for the Regular Spring Meeting of GA-HERO [topic(s), date, host]

It was agreed that the primary topic of discussion for the Spring meeting should be the relationship between the USG Retiree Council and GA-HERO.

It was also agreed that members of GA-HERO would assist in its further development by becoming mentors for organizing additional retiree organizations in the state. Dorothy has already begun doing this in support of efforts to get the retiree council underway. Bob McDonough said he would be very much interested in supporting these efforts, but would prefer to give a presentation that others had developed in the form of a “start-up” kit. Dennis Marks also volunteered to assist with this effort. It was also reported that Dave, and John, along with Dorothy, are currently engaged in efforts to organize additional retiree organizations.

Given that time was running out for today's meeting and the issue of electing officers of GA-HERO had not yet taken place, it was agreed that arrangements would be made by email between now and the April meeting to determine who might be proposed as candidates for given offices in GA-HERO.

Anne mentioned that the University of West Georgia might be willing to host the April meeting, but acknowledged that it might be considered too far outside of Atlanta to be convenient for persons from several institutions. It was agreed that there were several institutions in the metro Atlanta area that didn't have retiree organizations and that GA State University might be a more convenient place for a meeting while GA-HERO is assisting in bringing these into being.

It was agreed that the best time for a meeting in April would be on a Friday. Friday, April 17th or Friday, April 24th was identified as a suitable day for such a meeting.

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:40 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Anne C. Richards