Governance Group

Definition: Governance is the way the rules, norms, and actions are structured, sustained, regulated, and held accountable. The degree of formality depends on the internal rules of a given organization and, externally, with its business partners. As such, governance may take many forms, driven by many different motivations and with many different results. For instance, a government may operate as a democracy where citizens vote on who should govern and the public good is the goal, while a nonprofit organization may be governed by a small board of directors and pursue more specific aims.

Good nonprofit governance is all about focusing on the processes for making and implementing decisions that will continue to advance an organization’s principles and mission, providing strategic leadership to a nonprofit organization. -Non-Profit Quarterly

Discussion

It was determined that the current Ops Manual is the main document aside from the Society Bylaws that is used for governance of the Academy of Fellows. The Ops Manual is internally focused and lacks purpose for advancing the mission and strategic plan of SAME. Research of other Fellows organizations shows a similar form of governance.

The goal of the group was to increase participation and focus the Academy more towards the Society’s strategic plan through it’s governance.

It was determined that while there is a need for internal governance through certain vice chair positions and hierarchy via Regional and Post Fellows, there is also a need for externally focused leadership.

Because the goal of the group was dependent on input from other groups, this particular group will convene again via teleconference to review notes and assign tasks. Action: Kathy will schedule call prior to JETC.

Internal Governance

The group agreed that an important addition to the “internal governance” of the Academy would be a Vice Chair of Communications & Marketing. Many Fellows in the group voiced frustration with not knowing what is going on within the Academy. Some expressed the fact that they did not even know what the Academy was about. A member with a business development or marketing background could improve Fellow operations immensely.

It was also suggested that perhaps the internal structure mimic the National Leadership structure (i.e. a Vice Chair to oversee Regional Vice Chairs and a Vice Chair of Engagement to oversee external Vice Chairs)

Regional and Post Fellow positions should be more accurately described with an outline of clear duties associated and a metric for accountability.
External Governance (Outreach & Participation)

Additionally, it was suggested that the Vice Chair of Engagement be more focused on engaging participation from fellows according to their professional point in life. Past SAME President and current Foundation President, John Mogge, developed a graphical representation of Fellows cohorts based on this observation.

The group suggested a structure of Vice Chairs that corresponds to the existing Strategic Plan or Run to 2020 (future Strategic Plan). For example, a STEM Vice Chair or Liaison, or an LDP Vice Chair or Liaison. This person would be responsible for building a base of interested participants to reach out to for action. These vice chairs or liaisons could be managed by the Vice Chair for Engagement.

Class Structure

The group liked the idea of each Fellows Class mentoring the next class of Fellows. They also agreed that if the governance of the Academy was expanded, new Fellows could choose which areas of the Academy to engage in, prior to being invested (maybe in packet formation).

Finally, the group agreed that simplicity was also important when re-defining AOF Governance.
Participation and Accountability Group

Evaluate participation and Focus on being a Fellow

DISCUSSION ITEMS

What is active defined as? Identified that participation can be in many ways including in a single/annual event/activity (scholarships, Boy Scouts, Camp, Foundation, etc.)

“Ask”. All agreed that “Asking” and reaching out to all Fellows (especially the “retired” members) could make a difference.

Group recognized that there are some number of Fellows who are totally retired and may not have the desire

- Moved outside the industry
- Physically not able
- May not see the payback/value

Figure out their hot buttons

There is value to developing a “Fellow Opportunity List” which identified participation opportunities (includes activities that a Fellow can do remotely).

Are the Posts offering enough diversity in programs/activities?

Do all Posts have a committee or structured group of Fellows? Should they?

Regional Fellow Representatives

Are the Regional Fellows doing what we want??

Identified that Regional Fellows do not have communications with the AOF Chair

    Task Assigned (see Actions below)

Regional Fellows welcome direction on role expectations.

    Task Assigned (see Actions below)

Are the Regional Fellows engaging with the Post Fellow Representatives?

Class of Fellows

What about the idea of each Class of Fellows? All agree with this idea. Begins to start peer accountability.

Class of Fellow Leader should provide an annual report to the AOF on Class impact
While Class of Fellows will move forward, merit in reaching out to the Investiture Response lead for previous Classes to assist in updating the master AOF list and determining involvement level

    Task Assigned (see Actions below)

Senior Fellow

What about a Senior Fellow?

Not much support for it. Some understand this would help drive more participation but don’t like the idea of another level to make it happen. Feel those who give back after being Fellows already do so.

Fellow Emeritus

Fellow Emeritus Status: Full agreement on this.

Need to define the criteria to earn the Fellow Emeritus Status.

    Task Assigned (see Actions below)

Determine if this is an honorary position.

Centennial JETC

Memorialize who we lost at the Society

If Fellow Emeritus is an honorary role, consider hosting them at the Centennial JETC

Fellow’s Room at JETC? Not an idea that had merit or interest.

Accountability

With all of the above, the Society will generate accountability at all levels (AOF Chair, RFRs, Post Fellow Representatives, and through Class of Fellows)

Action Items:

1. Charge AOF Chair to develop Fellow Participation List for distribution (AOF Chair)
2. Charge to AOF Chair to establish and communicate key goals and ensure there is a standard communication process to Regional Fellows (AOF Chair)
3. Establish clear expectations and responsibilities for the Regional Fellows (Team Lead: Shawn Moore)
   a. Coordinate on Fellow’s packages
   b. Regional Fellows participate with the AOF Chair
   c. RFRs initiate communication with Post Fellow Representatives throughout the year
   d. Providing info to Fellows who don’t make it to DOD, SBC, or JETC for Fellow’s Luncheon
   e. Sharing best practice stories for engaging Fellows at Posts
   f. Assist with Fellow lists and contact info
g. Get Fellows engaged with the Foundation and Centennial Celebration

4. Create a Fellow List by class year and region. (National Office)
   a. Cindy to carry this forward via the RVPs
   b. Recommend default lead of each class is the person who gave the induction speech

5. Establish a Fellow Emeritus criteria and procedures (Team Lead: Siokey)

6. Memorialize who we lost at the Society

7. Establish a way for prior Fellow classes to reconnect at 2020 celebration (National Office/AOF/RFRs)
Redefining Mentoring Group

Definitions: A trusted counselor or guide. Normally a more experienced person to the mentor. A mentor is a counselor, coach, motivator, and role model. A mentor is a person who has a sincere desire to enhance the success of others. A person who volunteers time to help the mentee. Adaptation of Air National Guard definition.

Discussion

1. JETC Fellows mentoring event.
   a. Consider opening JETC mentoring event to anyone with an interest in being mentored, not just YMs. Would expanding beyond YMs detract from the event?
   b. Decision: Keep title same; AOF Chair to provide guidance/charge that every Fellow should bring a mentee (doesn’t need to be a YM). (Separate from registration).

2. Mentoring database
   a. Prior AOF initiative for searchable database to pair mentors with mentees did not progress; included partnership with other organizations but was expensive. Consider searchable, editable online database where mentors and mentees sign up.
   b. Do this as a 2020 target?
   c. Decision: Create “Find a Fellow Mentor” database to the website that facilitates mentoring pairs as a Run to 2020 target.
      i. Committee to be created to develop the details, to include participation requirements. Ex. Fellows only? Or Fellows highly encouraged to participate; larger membership welcomed as well?

3. Performance: A percentage (10%) is performing very highly, but we’re not sure how well we are fulfilling the charge and Pledge as an Academy. Need to validate the Fellows list to determine what true denominator is, then develop a metric that will signal success. Will dovetail nicely with mentoring database; include connectivity to CLAS system. Owner: AOF VC for Mentoring coordinating with Regional Fellow Coordinators.

4. Regional Fellows
   a. Currently, Regional Fellows mainly focus on previewing Fellow nominations. During the “off season,” can review Post Fellow activities and generate regional report.

5. Target audience for mentoring: anyone interested in being mentored.
   a. Discussion: anyone in transition, active members of SAME. K-12, college, YMs, new members, others.
   b. Differentiator for Fellows is work experience, SAME experience.
   c. Society should on all listed (K-12, college, YMs, combination, plus others); AOF should focus on members.

6. How do we keep Fellows engaged and focused on their charge to be a mentor beyond investiture?
   a. Find out who is active, who can we convert from inactivity to active, keep them involved by giving them a job.
7. Post events
   a. Potential 360’ mentoring groups

Action Items

1. JETC Fellow/YM event remains the same, but AOF Chair provides guidance and a charge to all Fellows to bring a mentee to the event.
2. Create a “Find a Fellow Mentor” database on the SAME website that facilitates mentoring pairs as a Run to 2020 target. Committee to be created to develop the details; anticipate AOF Chair to issue charge for all Fellows to register.
3. Performance: A percentage (10%) is performing very highly, but we’re not sure how well we are fulfilling the charge and Pledge as an Academy. Need to validate the Fellows list to determine what true denominator is, then develop a metric that will signal success. Will dovetail nicely with mentoring database; include connectivity to CLAS system. Owner: AOF VC for Mentoring coordinating with Regional Fellow Coordinators.
4. Target demographic: Society should focus on all who want to be mentored, while they Academy’s emphasis should be on members.

Parking Lot

1. Offer “buddy system” for first time JETC and conference/event attendees.
2. Fellows’ role in continuous mentoring of campers and scholarship recipients.
3. 360’ mentoring, modeled after ASCE’s program per Paula Loomis.
Fellows Selection Process Group

ITEM 1---BASIC SELECTION CRITERIA

CURRENT SCORING:

- Society Leadership --- 10%
- Outstanding Service to SAME --- 45%
- Outstanding Service to the Profession --- 35%
- Awards & Honors --- 10%

The basic selection criteria for Fellow recognition predate the Academy and were adopted unchanged by the Academy. The basic criteria are set forth in the Society Constitution and repeated in the Society Bylaws and include the requirements that one must have “rendered dedicated and outstanding service to the Society and to the engineering profession.” In addition, the Bylaws require that one must be a 10-year “active” member.

Q. Is this basic criterion a “promotion” criteria calling for promotion to Fellow by those expected to do “great things” ahead in the future for the Society or is it a criterion for recognition of past service or should it be something that encompasses both past and future service?
   1. We believe this is a “Recognition” NOT a “Promotion”.
   2. We also believe that it should be “Recognition” with “Expectation”.
   3. The nominee in the future should detail what he/she “commits” to do in accordance with the Fellow Charge.
   4. Scoring in both (Service to SAME) & (Service to Profession) should have 5% associated with each of the areas scoring their “Commitment” to our Fellow Charge.

Q. Is this basic criteria sound and appropriate for the future of SAME or are changes in order?
   1. We believe the basic criteria is sound, more guidance to the Nominee, Nominator, Reviewer and Selection Panel is needed.
   2. Define the “Commitment” by the individual to the Charge and explain they must address the commitment to SAME and the Profession.
   3. Service to the Profession is not just a list of positions, projects and a work resume, it should address what they are doing in their Community, STEM, Mentoring and any activities to Enhance the Profession.

Q. Should there be a heavy weighting of criteria based on future continued leadership service to the Society?
   1. Weighting is already between 55-65 / 35 for SAME accomplishments, we believe that is correct, but currently “Future” is very minor in just the Service to SAME, possibly at most 3-5%.
   2. Consider as noted in the previous, Basic Selection Criteria #4, giving 5% of SAME and Profession to commitment to future as “Stand Alone” scoring.

Q. Should Fellow status be revocable?
1. In our Fellow Bylaws if SAME membership is not kept current the individual is no longer a Fellow.
2. We believe a change from revoking to Emeritus is more appropriate.

Q. Should more credit be accorded Fellow nominees for leadership service at multiple tiers (post, region, national) of the Society?
1. We believe leadership above the Post may be restricted by one’s position in their profession, this is true for many of our dedicated volunteers.
2. With only 14 Committees and Councils, very few positions at Region for a non-Fellow and only 4 Elected directors annually, we believe the major credit for leadership should be at the Post level.
3. We believe Service to SAME should be divided 35% Post and 10% Region/National.

Q. What about the 10-year active membership requirement? Should it be longer? Shorter?
1. Currently it is stated as “preferably over 10 years active membership”.
2. We believe 10 years of elected or appointed leadership positions should be the Minimum.
3. Active membership could be misunderstood to be attending meetings, a Fellow needs to be “Involved” not an “Observing Pedestrian”.
4. Positions on committees at any level (Post, Region or National) should be equal.
5. Leadership positions should have more weight than members of committees.
6. Elected positions should also carry more weight than appointed positions.

Q. Should there be a limit on the number of new Fellows accepted each year? Should there be a limit on the total number of Fellows?
1. We do not believe there should be a cap annually.
2. No limit to the total, what we really need to do is determine how many Fellows we have and how many Fellows want to continue meeting their Fellow Charge!

ITEM 2—SELECTION REVIEW PROCESS

Q. The review process is conducted by a “blue ribbon” panel of both past and present Society leaders with diverse backgrounds in national, region and post leadership, the various military services, and private industry, and in professions. Is there a better review committee membership?
1. The committee membership changes about 1/3 every 2-3 years. There is an attempt to have a member of Active Duty Army, Navy and Air Force, a current government civilian and industry leaders on the panel. The meeting is held at the Century House where all the personnel and Society records are housed.
2. Fellows who wish to join the panel should let the Vice Chair, Selections know of their interest, he is always looking for “new blood”. Do note that volunteers do cover their travel costs to attend the meetings, or call in to the meeting.

Q. There is a scoring process that guides both the nominators and the reviewers to better focus on credentials for selection. Should it be revised or changed?
1. As previously noted there are some tweaks to the scoring which we suggest being accomplished: 5-10% for “future commitment”, Post, Regional, National scoring change and possibly other changes from the three other breakout groups.
2. As previously noted, earlier webinar for guidance (April/May), additional Regional Fellow webinar or call to better define their role (January-March), educate them on non-selection issues from previous year and any changes to guidance for the current year.

3. Training, Training and Training. We must train our future Fellows to address the issues needed, Post and Regional Fellows need to guide nominees, train our Selection Panel on what they should be looking for.

4. Nominators and recommenders need to consider holding a nominee and improving their application in lieu of just sending it in to get “turned down and get a debrief.”

Q. Should ultimate judgment of the review committee be eliminated or reduced, recognizing that “dedicated and outstanding service” necessitates some level of judgment?
   1. No, we believe that with better guidance to all involved, nominee, Post Fellow, Regional Fellow and Selection Panel.
   2. With any selection panel, these items require a level of judgement, with the appropriate guidance, this highly experienced panel with all levels of Society and Professional experience, is the appropriate method to recommend selection.

ITEM 3—TRANSPARENCY AND CONFIDENCE IN SELECTION PROCESS

Q. Does Society and Academy membership have confidence in the selection process?
   When I ask this very question with our 80+ Fellows, most voted YES, some had no position and 2 stated they did not have confidence.

Q. If not, what are the concerns and how should they be addressed? The concerns were:
   1. One believed if a Post recommended a person, then they should be a Fellow; which could have over 100 different beliefs of what is a qualified Fellow.
   2. The other believed that the selection should mirror a military selection board: independent selections by all parties with putting them in a composite group with a predetermined cut line and no meeting to discuss would happen. This could be done, but it is different than the selection procedure which has been used since the establishment of the Academy.

Q. Should final approval authority be one of process approval, and should final approval authority be returned to the Society Board of Direction?
   1. For many years the “Final Approval” was forwarded to the Board XC with the Vice Chair making a “Statistical Presentation” for approval. The current procedure is for the Chairman of the Academy and the President to be thoroughly briefed by the Vice Chair, Selection. This has little difference from briefing the XC but allows the notice of selection to go out earlier for the Investiture.
   2. We believe the current process is sufficient.

Action Items:
   1. Consider adding to both Service to SAME and Service to Profession scoring (5%) for Commitment to our Fellow Charge.
2. Consider increasing scope of Service to Profession from just positions and projects to include: Community, STEM, Mentoring and any activities to Enhance the Profession, having 20% job and 15% external enhancement.
3. Consider Service to SAME as primarily at the Post level with scoring divided 35% Post and 10% Region and National.
4. Consider changing 10-year active to 10-years elected or appointed leadership positions as a Minimum.
5. Consider having elected positions receive more weight than appointed positions with all levels (Post, Region and National) equal.
6. Consider providing an annual request for Selection Panel members to all Fellows.
7. Consider formalizing the Selection Panel positions with a minimum of 3ea active military leaders, 1ea current government civilian and 2ea industry leaders.
8. Provide Webinar training to prospective fellows, post fellows, regional fellows and selection panel in April – May timeframe, before the applications are finalized.
9. Provide general debriefing to all Regional Fellows on general issues noted from recent selections in January – March timeframe.
10. Notify all non-select nominees and their nominators that debriefs will be provided upon request.