

Senate Update Region J

- Tamaira Ross
- Shaunna Winton
- Mindy McCord

Agenda

Proposed Bylaws Amendments

- S1608: Collegiate Director Eligibility
- S1609: Director of Regions Eligibility
- S1610: Collegiate Director Term
- S1611: Vacancies
- S1613: Honorary Members
- S1615: Dues
- S1616: External Policy Responsibility
- S1617: Trademarks and Emblems

Motion

• S1618: Employee Sponsored Membership

What's next?

Questions



Discussions and Postings

Discussions are posted with each amendment/motion on the Senate Teamwork site (communities is unavailable at this time)

Each of the amendments were also posted to the Senate website, <u>senate.swe.org</u>, and announced in the All Together.



Overview

- This change will make the collegiate director eligibility language consistent with other sections of the bylaws.
- Sections 4A, 4B, 4C all begin "Candidates for."

Background

• This recommendation is coming from the FY16 Nominating Committee.



Proposed Changes:

The **Candidates for** collegiate director must:

1. Be a collegiate member of the Society in good standing for the immediately previous year; and

2. Be a member of the Society in good standing; and

3. Have at least two years experience in the aggregate in at least two SWE positions with significant leadership responsibility.





Discussion Pro:

- Clarifies that the candidate must be eligible for the position before running for it.
- Also clarifies/maintains the requirement that the collegiate director must be a collegiate member in the year before serving.

Discussion Con:

• None

Other areas of impact in SWE:

• None



Who does this directly affect?

Candidates for Collegiate Director

Budget Impact

• N/A

Impact to Region



Overview

- Bylaws state that the deputy director shall "Fill a vacancy in the office of director of regions for the remainder of the term."
- Therefore, a candidate for deputy director should have to meet the same criteria as that of the director of regions.

Background

- This recommendation is coming from the FY16 Nominating Committee.
- This question came up in this past election cycle and the Nominating Committee consulted with the society parliamentarian who explained the above.



Proposed Changes:

Candidates for director of regions <u>and deputy director of</u> <u>regions</u> must have served as a region governor.





Discussion Pro:

• This amendment would clarify the point for future candidates and nominating committee members.

Discussion Con:

None

Other areas of impact in SWE:

None



Who does this directly affect?

Candidates for Director of Regions

Budget Impact

• N/A

Impact to Region



Overview

- The collegiate director currently holds a one year term on the BOD which separates this role from other director roles which are all two years.
- This proposed bylaws amendment changes the term for the collegiate director to two years.

Background

- This recommendation is coming from the governance working groups.
- It takes a new member of the BOD several months of ramp up time to become effective and learn the new position (similar to any other role) and with a shorter term length, by the time the new collegiate director is up to speed on projects and other facets of the job, her term is already winding down.
- Frequency of turnover limits the ability to drive larger projects or initiatives and can make interactions with committees challenging.



Proposed Changes:

C. The secretary, treasurer, directors, and director of regions, and <u>collegiate director</u> shall serve for two fiscal years, with terms staggered as follows:

1. The secretary, **collegiate director**, and two directors shall take office during even-numbered fiscal years.

2. The treasurer, two directors, and the director of regions shall take office during odd-numbered fiscal years.

Article IV, Section 2.C:

The collegiate director for the next fiscal year shall be elected by the collegiate section presidents to:

(Remainder unchanged)

Article IV, Section 2.D:

The deputy director of regions and collegiate director shall serve for one fiscal year.





Discussion Pro:

- Changing the term length for the collegiate director to two years would provide consistency with other BOD Director positions which are also currently two-year positions.
- It would allow the collegiate director to become more effective by giving her more time to understand the role, develop relationships, and gain momentum.

Discussion Con:

• Fewer members will have the opportunity to hold this role given the longer term of service.

Other areas of impact in SWE:

 Actions to update the election manual would follow the passing of this amendment.



Clarification of impacts

As mentioned on S-1610 under "Cons," fewer members will have the opportunity to hold the role of collegiate director. What should also be made clear is that this will disproportionally impact a portion of the collegiates based on their graduation date. There would be groups of collegiates who are never eligible in their final year to run for collegiate director.

Collegiate members who graduate during *even* fiscal years could not be on the slate the following odd year because the position is not open and would not qualify the next fiscal year because they are now professional members.

Note: Whether or not S-1608 – Collegiate Director Eligibility passes has no impact on the issue noted above.



<u>Timing</u>

Because this is an electronic vote no amendments can be made at this time.

The first group of members to potentially be adversely impacted would be FY18 graduates during the election process for FY20 starting in Fall 2018.



Options to avoid this portion of the impact

- 1. Reject S-1610. It will automatically be brought back at the Annual Conference in October and could be amended during the in-person meeting. This would mean the soonest the collegiate director could have a two year term would be starting in FY19.
- 2. Pass S-1610 now and during FY17 or 18 pass an amendment that shifts the collegiate membership requirement to two-years before in office on the BOD.
- 3. Pass S-1610 now and during FY17 or 18 pass whatever broader amendment(s) bring the collegiate director position closer to the desired end state in alignment with the governance discussions.



Who does this directly affect?

- Collegiate Director
- Nominating Committee

Budget Impact

• N/A

Impact to Region



Overview

• This proposed bylaws amendment allows the membership to fill a vacancy instead of the senate.

Background

- This recommendation is coming from the governance working groups.
- The proposed governance structure doesn't include the senate as it is today. A new Strategic Advisory Board would be created to take on the strategic responsibilities of the current Senate and related committees.
- This change is one step in our governance re-alignment that will better align roles and responsibilities to the correct organizations.



Proposed Changes:

Article IV, Section 2.C.2.c.:

Fill a vacancy in the office of director of regions for the remainder of the term. A vacancy in the deputy director of regions position shall be filled by the **membership** senate within sixty days of the vacancy.

Article IV, Section 8.A:

A vacancy in the office of president shall be filled by the president elect for the remainder of the term, followed by one full term as president, provided that the president elect was elected to that office by the general membership. A president elect elected by the senate to fill a vacancy shall only assume the presidency for the remainder of the term. In such a case, the ballots for the next election will include an election for both president and president elect.



Proposed Changes:

Article IV, Section 8.B:

A vacancy in the office of president elect shall be filled for the remainder of the term by the **membership** senate within sixty days of the vacancy. A person filling a vacancy as president elect shall not automatically become president, but shall be eligible to be a candidate for president or president elect for the following fiscal year, regardless of the amount of time served while filling the vacancy.

Article IV, Section 8.C.:

A vacancy in any other member-elected board position shall be filled by **the membership** the senate within sixty days of the vacancy.





Discussion Pro:

- The Nominating Committee currently vets candidates during the normal election process.
- The membership already elects the board and should elect the person that would fill a vacancy.

Discussion Con:

- There will be additional workload on the nominating committee that would be out of cycle from their normal process and has the potential for interfering with that process, depending on the timing.
- There will be a cost in doing a full ballot of the membership.

Other areas of impact in SWE:

• Actions to update procedures would follow the passing of this amendment.



Who does this directly affect?

- Nominating Committee
- HQ

Budget Impact

- Staff time to get information out to entire membership
- Verifying integrity of the votes (control codes)

Impact to Region



Overview

- This change removes the grade of honorary member from the Society bylaws.
- This grade of membership is not used within the Society.
 Background
- This recommendation is coming from the governance working groups.



Proposed Changes:

Article II, Section 1.E.:

E. Honorary

1. A person who has achieved recognition as outstanding in the field of engineering or who has made a significant contribution of service to the Society may be elected an honorary member by a unanimous vote of those senators present and voting. Honorary members shall not be required to pay dues.

2. Honorary members shall not have the right to make or second motions, vote, or run for office; however, if a member of any grade is elected to honorary membership, that member retains the rights of the grade of membership held immediately prior to election as an honorary member.

(Strike entire section and renumber accordingly)





Discussion Pro:

 A review of the membership roster with HQ showed that there are no honorary members within the organization. By making this change, no change to anyone's membership status will occur. The change is a housekeeping item to eliminate a membership grade that we are not utilizing.

Discussion Con:

• This grade of membership will not be available for future use.



Who does this directly affect?

None

Budget Impact

• None

Impact to Region



S1615: Dues

S1615: Dues

Overview

• This change moves the ownership of the dues from the Senate to the BOD.

Background

- The governance subgroups have each been tasked with identifying areas in the bylaws that can be amended during FY16.
- The proposed governance structure doesn't include the senate as it is today. A new Strategic Advisory Board would be created to take on the strategic responsibilities of the current senate and related committees.
- This task is a tactical responsibility and fits best with the board in the new structure.



S1615: Dues

Proposed Changes:

Article II, Section 3.A.:

All members shall pay dues directly to the Society headquarters. Dues for all individual grades of membership, including any percentage allocation of funds rebated to sections, members at large and regions, shall be set by the **board of directors**. senate. Dues for all other grades of membership shall be set by the board of directors.

The following amendment will be automatically adopted as a consequential amendment if this proposal is adopted:

Article V, Section 2.B.2:

2. Set dues for all individual grades of membership, including allocation percentages of funds rebated to sections, members at large, and regions;





S1615: Dues

Discussion Pro:

- The board already owns the fiduciary responsibility to the society and the setting of membership dues fits within those duties.
- The board understands our competitive and global environments making that body the most informed to make these types of decisions.

Discussion Con:

- Limited representative input to the dues.
- The senate will no longer have the checks and balances ability over setting the dues rebates.

Other areas of impact in SWE:

• Actions to update procedures would follow the passing of this amendment.



S1615: Dues

Who does this directly affect?

- BOD
- Senate

Budget Impact

None

Impact to Region



Overview

• This change moves the ownership of external policy from the Senate to the BOD.

Background

- The governance subgroups have each been tasked with identifying areas in the bylaws that can be amended during FY16.
- The proposed governance structure doesn't include the senate as it is today. A new Strategic Advisory Board would be created to take on the strategic responsibilities of the current senate and related committees.
- The strategic body and other committees will help develop the external polices and the board will take the tactical role of approving the policy.



Proposed Changes:

Article IV, Section 2.A.:

The board of directors shall be the chief operational policy setting body of the Society, and shall also be responsible for approving statements of external policy on issues or positions that have broad implications for the professional environment and the Society as an organization. As such, the board of directors shall manage the business and affairs of the Society. The board shall also serve as the external face of SWE on issues affecting women in engineering and technology, act as stewards of the Society's resources (i.e., people, time, and money), and use of the SWE brand...(*Remainder unchanged.*)

The following amendment will be automatically adopted as a consequential amendment if this proposal is adopted:

Article V, Section 2.A:

The senate shall be responsible for charting the strategic direction of SWE by developing and adopting the long-range goals for the Society. The senate shall also be responsible for developing statements of external policy on issues or positions that have broad implications for the professional environment and the Society as an organization. To these ends, the senate shall conduct essential dialogue on long-term trends and issues of common interest, and may appoint subordinate units to assist in the creation of these strategic directions or policies. The senate shall communicate the outcome of such dialogue to the board of directors.





Discussion Pro:

• The board currently has the responsibility to approve the internal and operational policies of the society, so this change aligns this task to the most appropriate organization.

Discussion Con:

 With the current senate structure, there is a process for reviewing and disseminating information to the membership. There is a concern that external policy approvals in the future may not get the broad discussion as they do today.

Other areas of impact in SWE:

Actions to update procedures would follow the passing of this amendment.



Who does this directly affect?

- BOD
- Senate

Budget Impact

None

Impact to Region



Overview

• This change moves the ownership of approving Trademarks and Emblems from the Senate to the BOD.

Background

- The governance subgroups have each been tasked with identifying areas in the bylaws that can be amended during FY16.
- The proposed governance structure doesn't include the senate as it is today. A new Strategic Advisory Board would be created to take on the strategic responsibilities of the current senate and related committees.
- This change is one step in our governance re-alignment that will better align roles and responsibilities to the correct organizations.



Proposed Changes:

Article IV, Section 2.A.: (beginning unchanged) **<u>4. Approve changes to the Society's trademarks or other emblems</u>; (renumber accordingly)**

The following amendment will be automatically adopted as a consequential amendment if this proposal is adopted:

Article V, Section 2.B.4 :

The senate shall also:

1. Consider and, if necessary, vote upon recommendations received from throughout the Society;

2. Set dues for all individual grades of membership, including allocation percentages of funds rebated to sections, members at large, and regions;

3. Establish policies on the use and restrictions of the Reserve Fund of the Society;

4. Approve changes to the Society's trademarks or other emblems;

- 5. Approve changes to the number of regions or regional boundaries; and
- 6. Approve changes to these bylaws.





Discussion Pro:

- The board already works closely with SWE's marketing firm, David James Group (DJG), who understands and markets SWE's brand.
- The board understands the larger environment and our competitors. They are best informed on what SWE needs to do to market itself to remain relevant.

Discussion Con:

- Limited representative input to the Society's emblems and trademarks.
- The senate will no longer have the checks and balances ability over such changes.



Who does this directly affect?

- BOD
- Senate

Budget Impact

None

Impact to Region



Motion S1618: Approve Employer Sponsored Membership Program

S1618: Employee Sponsored Membership

- The employer sponsored membership pilot will conclude its fourth year at the end of FY17.
- The initial pilot was approved for four years (ending at the conclusion of FY17) with a progress report due to the Senate during FY16.
 - That report was given to the Senate on February 13, 2016 in Philadelphia.
- The Society would like to move from a pilot to an official membership program beginning in FY17.
- The Board shall conduct analysis on the program every three years or at any time when the professional membership dues are increased.
 - And they will report to the Senate on this program when requested.



S1618: Employee Sponsored Membership

Discussion Pro:

- Increased membership for the Society
- Improve corporate ability to leverage SWE as a platform for all women engineers
- Improve visibility of sections with major local employers
- Increases SWE reach/impact
- Very low acquisition cost
- Did not significantly increase our membership service costs
- New Association Membership System will make it easier to track and market to these members

Discussion Con:

- Communications to this group of members needs to be customized and high touch
- Not everyone who joins via this channel will be active in their local section; sections should not consider this a failure if attendance in section meetings does not spike.
- Since this was a pilot, we are still learning. Further adaptations may be required as the program matures.

Other areas of impact in SWE:

• Actions to update procedures would follow the passing of this amendment.





What's Next?

What's Next?

Jun 13: Final Senate discussion call for Amendments and Motions

Jun 13: Voting opens on all Amendments and Motions

Jun 27: Voting Closes



Reminder on Electronic Bylaws Amendments

Two-thirds of the entire voting membership of the senate at an in-person meeting or <u>ninety percent of the entire</u> <u>voting membership of the senate</u> by electronic ballot shall be required to amend these bylaws.

• <u>30 of 33 Senators</u>. Your vote matters!

If the electronic ballot requirement is not achieved, the proposal shall automatically be placed on the agenda of the next in-person meeting.

Voting will open June 13 following one last discussion call



Questions?