Questions from AEA Retired Executive Committee were as follows:

At the AEA Retired Exec. Board meeting on Nov. 8, 2011

a. How is the weighted vote figured? Total # of members in a region ÷1200= X (X is the weighted vote).
b. How many votes does AEA Retired have presently?
c. How are other states handling the concern of ratio of retired members to active members in their boards of Directors?
d. What are we gaining if we change our weighted vote?
e. What do we lose if we change our weighted vote?
f. Are we going to lose our voice on the AEA B.O.D.?
g. Does our retired membership count along with the active membership in each region (so counted twice)?
h. When/How could we gain a member on the board as our membership increases?
i. We have a superior relationship with our AEA leadership and our active members; would this impact that?
j. How do we assure each of our members that their individual membership counts on AEA Board of Directors?

Questions from email after the meeting:

A. Danny Barlow:

If the AEAR Director becomes a "member at large" director, what change happens to the other "at large" directors? In other words, if retired members are no longer counted in other regions, shouldn't the same thing be done to ESP and minority members...why should they be counted within their regions and also have a designated at large director? I'm not interested in taking anything away from those two groups - I just wonder why AEAR's status would become unique. We would become neither fish nor fowl, but something in between a region and a special needs group. I understand that AEAR members pay much lower dues, and I can see the how we might need to have fewer weighted votes, but I'm not sure that this current suggestion is acceptable to me.

B. Ken Freed

I have begun speaking to people in Region 1 relative to Region 1 (TEA) "active" members as compared to allotment of votes per Board member. Though AEA documents may state that all members in a region (ie: Retired, Student?) are counted towards weighted vote, each person I

have spoken to has indicated that the calculted weighted vote is representative of only the active membership. My review of some of the recent compliance review documents also indicates that "actives" are the only people counted. If the documents were adhered to, then locals that also happen to contain Universities would get a boost due to student membership. This does not happen.

While I have no true objection to the current manner of counting, I do object to the idea that AEA-R relinquish its calculated weighted vote because of an "active" decrease in membership. Correct me if I am wrong, but when "active" membership climbed to 30,000+ members, thus diluting the AEA-R weighted vote, it was not suggested that changes be made to maintain the AEA-R relative position.

Further, referencing our dues creates a specious argument. Other than providing a meeting place, and Mike Aicone for approximately 10 hours per year, what does AEA provide the retired member for the dues they collect? As compared to the "active," very little. This is as it should be, but since I believe that the services equates with the amount of dues, the argument that we pay less dues and hence deserve less representation does nothing but classify AEA-R as second class members.

C. Suzan Austin:
I believe Danny has raised a valid question. Since we are the only "growing" group, why should our voice be diminished? I am aware we contribute less money, but we have contributed more over the many years we have been members compared to many newbies. We are the largest region but have only one director -- I thought some other regions have more than one -- am I mistaken? Somehow this smells like Denmark to me.

D. Barb Joseph
Danny is asking the same questions I had Tuesday but wasn't sure I was informed enough to ask. What makes the ethnic minority and ESP at-large people entitled to two votes (one for their region and one for being at-large)? As the largest growing group of the AEA, us Retired folks are being shuffled to second best As he stated, those other groups are being counted where they live/work but because we are a state-wide local, our Region is our "home" although if I understood the discussion, we are also counted in the other regions based on our addresses. If our numbers are pulled from the areas where we live to balance the equality of the vote, then those in EM or ESP should be pulled and they only count

once. If we are to be At Large with only one vote to equalize the voting, then the same should apply to the other At Large groups. The ESP people have both local associations as well as the At Large representation, so they need to be either fish or fowl, they can't have it both ways. As far as the Ethnic Minority At Large, they should either be counted within their region, thus one vote per region, or pulled out, not counted in the region numbers and then allowed only the one At Large vote as they want to allot to AEA-R. With the size of our membership, we should be entitled to at least one more representative, much like the larger regions in the state (Mesa, for example). Since I live in the north valley area but am more associated with the central area, count me as a AEA-R region member, not in either area, and recognize me as such. Our Region membership consists of both retired certified and ESP educators, thus if all was fair in love, war and voting, with the rationale of the AEA powers that be, our group should be split into at least the two groups and if you wanted to get finite, some would become ESP-Retired, but we think of ourselves as one united and contiguous membership known as AEA-Retired. I am not sure if all of this makes sense but we need to stick to our principles and insist that we maintain our Region designation. DON'T MESS WITH OLD PEOPLE!!!!

There were no other "reply all" emails regarding this discussion.