AGENDA
2011-2012 BOARD OF GOVERNORS
April 19-20, 2012

Day & Time: Thursday, April 19, 12:00 PM – 5:00 PM*
Friday, April 20, 8:00 AM – 1:00 PM

Location: ASME Headquarters
New York, NY

1. Opening of the Meeting
2:30 PM – 2:35 PM

1.1. Call to Order. Victoria Rockwell

1.2. Adoption of the Agenda. Victoria Rockwell ACTION
A motion should be made to accept the Agenda as circulated on April 5, 2012.

1.3. Announcements. Victoria Rockwell

2. Discussion Items
2:35 PM Thursday – 12:50 PM Friday

2.1. Committee of the Whole. Victoria Rockwell ACTION
A motion should be made to approve going “as if in Committee of the Whole,” where open discussion is permitted and only a memo of issues discussed by topic is maintained by the Secretary.

2.2. Report on Executive Sessions. (5 minutes) Victoria Rockwell INFORMATION
   a. February 16, 2012
   b. April 19, 2012

2.3. Sector Management Committee (5 minutes) Marc Goldsmith INFORMATION

2.4. Generative Discussion

2.4.1. Global Talent Development (45 minutes) INFORMATION
   Robert Pangborn and Karen Calo
   (Agenda Appendix 2.4.1)

*Thursday Executive Session planned for 12:00 PM – 2:10 PM. Separate Agenda will be sent to those invited to attend.
2.5. **Strategic Discussion**

2.5.1. **Phase 1 of 2 – Proposed Redesign of Knowledge and Community Sector (30 minutes)**
Thomas Libertiny and Michael Ireland
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.1)

2.5.2. **Proposed New Sector for Students and Early Career. (30 minutes)**
Stacey Swisher-Harnetty, Thomas Libertiny, and Cynthia Stong
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.2)

2.5.3. **Energy Indicators Scorecard. (15 minutes)**
Richard Laudenat
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.3)

2.5.4. **Summary of Engineers Week 2012 (15 minutes)**
Victoria Rockwell and Michael Cowan
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.4)

Resume 8:00 AM Friday, April 20, 2012 (Continental Breakfast at 7:30 AM)

2.5.5. **Update on 2013-15 Budget Development. (60 minutes)**
Reginald Vachon and Michael Weis
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.5)

2.5.6. **ASME.org Task Force Progress Report. (15 minutes)**
Said Jahanmir and Susan O’Neil
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.6)

2.5.7. **Update on Engagement Models. (40 minutes)**
Thomas Pestorius and Roy Arbeit
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.7)

2.5.8. **ASME Digital Library - Update on New Platform. (5 minutes)**
Philip DiVietro
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.8)

BREAK 10:00 AM to 10:15 AM

2.5.9. **HQ Task Force Update. (45 minutes)**
Thomas Pestorius and Reginald Vachon
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.9)

2.5.10. **CPP Task Force and Committee Participation. (5 minutes)**
Sam Zamrik
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.10)

2.5.11. **2012 Board Performance Assessment Survey Findings. (25 minutes)**
Betty Bowersox
(Agenda Appendix 2.5.11)
2.5.12. Quarterly Message/Communication Bullet Points. (15 minutes) INFORMATION
   Robert Pangborn and Betty Bowersox
   (Agenda Appendix 2.5.12)

2.5.13. Update on Committee on Governance Activities. (5 minutes) INFORMATION
   Robert Pangborn
   (Agenda Appendix 2.5.13)

2.5.14. Board Retreat Preparation. (60 minutes) INFORMATION
   Marc Goldsmith and Jess Dods
   (Agenda Appendix 2.5.14)

3. Action Items
   12:50 PM – 12:55 PM

   3.1 Motion to Return to Formal Session
      A motion should be made to move out “as if in Committee of the Whole.”

      3.1.1 Phase 1 of 2 – Proposed Redesign of Knowledge and Community Sector
      Thomas Libertiny and Michael Ireland
      (Agenda Appendix 2.5.1)

      3.1.2 Student and Early Career Sector
      Stacey Swisher Harnetty, Thomas Libertiny, and Cynthia Stong
      (Agenda Appendix 2.5.2)

4. Consent Calendar
   12:55 PM – 1:00 PM

   The Consent Calendar is limited to items of a routine or non-controversial nature, grouped together to save Board time. Consent Items for Receipt are report items for information, followed by Consent Items for Action that the Board is asked to take action on as a group.

   Governors are encouraged to contact ASME Headquarters with their questions prior to the meeting as it is not expected that Consent Receipt or Action items are to be removed from the Agenda. Reports, whether for information or action, are to be in writing and part of the Consent Calendar, unless otherwise approved by the President.

4.1. Consent Items for Receipt

   4.1.1. Report by the Treasurer. Webb Marner
      Financial statements will be distributed under separate cover.

   4.1.2. Sector Management Committee Report.
      Marc Goldsmith
      (Agenda Appendix 4.1.2)

   4.1.3. Motion for Receipt. ACTION
4.2. Consent Items for Action

4.2.1. Identification of Items to be removed from Consent Calendar.
Any action item(s) may be removed from the consent calendar by request from any member of the Board of Governors.

4.2.2. Approval of Minutes from Meeting on February 16, 2012.

4.2.3. Committee on Organization and Rules. Dennis Achgill

4.2.3.1. Proposed Appointments.
(Agenda Appendix 4.2.3.1)

4.2.3.2. Constitutional Amendment.

4.2.3.2.1. ASME Constitution Article C3.1.4.
(Agenda Appendix 4.2.3.2.1)

4.2.3.3. Proposed By-Laws for Second Reading and Adoption.

4.2.3.3.1. By-Law Revision B5.3.
(Agenda Appendix 4.2.3.3.1)

4.2.3.4. Proposed Revisions to Society Policy.

4.2.3.4.1. P-15.2 Engineers’ Licensing
(Agenda Appendix 4.2.3.4.1)

4.2.4. COFI Recommendations on Dues Adjustment.
Reginald Vachon
(Agenda Appendix 4.2.4)

4.2.5. Initiative Fund for Engineering for Change
Reginald Vachon
(Agenda Appendix 4.2.5)
4.2.6. Dates of Future Meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 2012(a)</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 11:30 AM</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Montreal, Quebec, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2012(b)</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 11:30 AM</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30 AM – 3:00 PM</td>
<td>Montreal, Quebec, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18-20, 2012(b)</td>
<td>Wednesday to Friday</td>
<td>6:00 PM July 18 to 9:30 PM</td>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13, 2012(b)</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:00 PM – 1:30 PM</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 14, 2012(b)</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00 AM – 1:00 PM</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2012(b)</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>8:30 AM – 10:00 AM</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 AM – 4:30 PM</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 14, 2013(b)</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:00 PM – 2:00 PM</td>
<td>Web Conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 18, 2013(b)</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:00 PM – 1:30 PM</td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2013(b)</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00 AM – 1:00 PM</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) 2011-2012 Board of Governors (b) 2012-2013 Board of Governors

4.3. Motion for Consent Action

5. Contingency Time for Discussion and Other Business

Subject to the President’s discretion, Contingency Time may be used for discussion of items pulled from the Consent Calendar and Other Business.

6. Adjournment

1:00 PM
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Date Submitted: April 2, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other)
Presented by: Rob Pangborn and Karen Calo
Agenda Title: Global Talent Development

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

Rob Pangborn, on behalf of COG, will introduce guest speaker Karen Calo of IBM, who will discuss “Global Talent Development.”

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)
None

Attachments: None
Date Submitted: 2012 March 27
BOG Meeting Date: 2012 April 19-20

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) Knowledge & Community Sector (K&C)
Presented by: Tom Libertiny and Mike Ireland
Agenda Title: Phase 1 of 2—Proposed Redesign of the Knowledge & Community Sector

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

A presentation will be made on proposed changes to the Knowledge & Community (K&C) Sector in order to:

1) Increase the quality of services provided to our volunteer members and leaders
2) Assist with ASME’s worldwide growth
3) Upgrade succession planning by providing additional leadership opportunities within the K&C Sector and greater access to those opportunities

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)
Action is requested to approve the following Motion:

To endorse the Knowledge & Community (K&C) Board’s proposal to redesign the K&C Sector, and to direct the Committee on Rules (COR) to bring required proposed bylaw revisions to the Board of Governors (BOG) for action in 2012 June.

Attachments:
One
Knowledge & Community Sector
Redesign Update—2012 April

Board of Governors

ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

**Value to Society**

**Mission**
Disseminating knowledge, research & development, and creating the opportunity for all of our members to develop content and relationships

**Focus on the Customer**
- ASME members or users whose engagement with ASME is through geography and/or a specific technical interest
- Increase the development of locally relevant content by providing outstanding service and tools to our global members
- Increase technology transfer by focusing on research, development and the dissemination of content to identified markets

**Improving Internal Processes**
- Increase leadership opportunities—succession planning
- Increase volunteer and staff bandwidth through separation of strategic planning from operations and through the involvement of more global volunteers
- Leverage the respective strengths of volunteers and staff

Help ASME to achieve growth metrics for membership engagement and increased revenues
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Value to Society

Why is K&C recommending this change?
• The status quo is not working—trying to be Everything to Everyone
• Needs are not being met—service levels are inconsistent

Proposed Benefits of the Redesign
For our Members and Future Members
• Focus on core competencies
• Focus on growth in clearly identified areas
• Home for grassroots initiatives and incubation of those initiatives
• Address evolving technology needs with flexibility in operations and structure

For our Leaders (volunteers and staff)
• Free assets (volunteers, staff and money) for enterprise-wide strategic initiatives and growth opportunities
• Provide world-class service
• Provide a larger pool of volunteers with greater sector experience for succession planning

ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Proposed changes for Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013

Sr. Vice President K&C
Vice President Affinity
Vice President Global
Vice President Technical
Vice President Finance
Vice President Programs & Activities
Committee Chair Communications
Committee Chair Rules & Governance

Sr. Vice President Worldwide Community
Vice President North America
Vice President South America
Vice President Asia & Africa
Vice President Europe & Middle East
Vice President Virtual Engagement
Staff Membership

Vice President Institutes*
Vice President Technical Communities**
Vice President IGTI
Vice President IPTI

FY 2012
Positions focus on strategic business issues based on growth areas identified by the enterprise and sector.

FY 2013
Potential structure to be determined by taskforce consisting of K&C and Institutes.*

*Comprised of 32 Technical Divisions from K&C and 2 Institutes.

ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

**Worldwide Community Sector**

- **Sr. Vice President Worldwide Community**
- **Operational issues**
  - VP North America A, B
  - VP South America C, D
  - VP Asia E, F
  - VP Europe & Middle East G, H
  - VP Virtual Engagement I, J

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Chair</th>
<th>A) <strong>Membership</strong></th>
<th>B) <strong>Content Development</strong></th>
<th>C) <strong>To be determined</strong></th>
<th>D) <strong>To be determined</strong></th>
<th>E) <strong>To be determined</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
<td>tbd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Potential committee assignments: VP North America is responsible for coordinating A and B. Additional committees can be added and sunset quickly.*

**Strategy Appendix 2.5.1**

**Worldwide Community & Institutes Sectors—Staff Lead with Volunteer Partnership**

- **Direct Collaboration**
  - Membership staff
  - Marketing staff
  - Global Offices staff
- **Indirect Collaboration**
  - Public Affairs & Outreach staff
  - ASME.org staff
  - Global Alliances staff
  - Governance staff
  - Other staff as needed

**Structure:** Robust flexibility.

**Customer:** Group/unit leaders

**Mission of sector infrastructure:** Help our customers to create locally accessible Intellectual Content and communication channels (example: events); and to provide networking opportunities.

1. Finance
2. Mentoring & Orientation
3. Communication
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Worldwide Community Sector—Potential Operational Mapping

Sr. Vice President K&C
Vice President Affinity
Vice President Global
Vice President Technical
Vice President Finance
Vice President Programs & Activities
Committee Chair Communications
Committee Chair Rules & Governance
Sr. Vice President Worldwide Community
Committee Chair Membership
Vice Presidents 5 total*
Sunset (moved to Staff/Volunteer partnership)
Sunset (moved to Staff/Volunteer partnership)
Committee Chair Content Development
Committee Chair Rules & Governance
Vice President Technical (proposed move to Institutes)

*No mapping from present K&C Vice Presidents. Job descriptions to be developed following the completion of the K&C redesign

ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Questions

Questions
K&C Redesign: Phase 1 of 2 (FY2012)
1. Streamline mission
2. Change sector board's focus to strategy (Sr. VP and VPs)
3. Change VP focus to strategic community growth
4. Change sector organization
5. Rename sector

Action is requested to approve the following Motion:

To endorse the Knowledge & Community (K&C) Board's proposal to redesign the K&C Sector, and to direct the Committee on Rules (COR) to bring required proposed bylaw revisions to the Board of Governors (BOG) for action in 2012 June.
### ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

#### Timeline for Fiscal Year 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 January</td>
<td>K&amp;C Board Vote on new K&amp;C organization for FY 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Call special K&amp;C Board vote on path forward for transition (Jan 30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presidential Team briefing (Feb 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send high level deck to Dave S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 February</td>
<td>Sector Management Committee briefing on K&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Governors briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutes, K&amp;C Sr. VP telecon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Finance &amp; Investment briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nominating Committee briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 March</td>
<td>Sector Management Committee briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Governors briefing (Webinar on March 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Finance &amp; Investment briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussions with Section Leaders, District Leaders, Technical Division Leaders, Technical Group Leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 April</td>
<td>Nominating Committee briefing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Governors review in preparation for June bylaw updates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 June</td>
<td>Board of Governors vote to approve new K&amp;C structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board of Governors vote to change K&amp;C bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 July</td>
<td>New Worldwide Community Sector launched</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ongoing discussions with Institutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

#### K&C Sector Today

- 85,000 total users each year (members and non-members)
- $5 million operation
- K&C contributes >$5 million revenue
- 3,000 active volunteers
- 16 staff
- 100% utilization of assets for ongoing operations (volunteers, staff, money)

#### Products and Services

- >$250,000 in awards given annually from the Technical Divisions
- >1,000 Section programs
- 15-20 Technical Conferences, with the papers contributed into 23 Technical Journals
- Congress—thousands of technical papers presented to a global audience
- 12 research committees with over 400 participants (e.g. Risk and Water Management Technologies)
- Podcasts and Webinars
- Energy Committee
- Position statements/Board on Government Relations/Standards & Certification Sector

#### Student Services

- 12-15 Student Leadership Seminars (SLS)
- 12-15 Student Professional Development conferences (SPDC)
- >2,000 Student Section programs
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Advantages and Challenges

**Advantages**
1. Robust flexibility for growth
2. Aligned with Enterprise-wide growth areas—VP’s represent strategic areas of growth
3. Easier reporting and improved accountability
4. Simplified organization from customer perspective
5. Streamlined Committee launch and sunset process
6. Focus on voice of customer and improved service
7. Succession planning/talent pool incorporated into structure

**Challenges**
1. Budgeting during transition—need to run some existing programs in parallel with new programs for one fiscal year
2. Managed approach to deployment of resources
3. Potential overlap with other Sectors
4. Transition period will require high workload for volunteers and staff
5. Timing of Technical Sector/Institute discussions, workload, process—new taskforce consisting of K&C and Institutes members
6. Leadership transition
7. Identifying people for VP positions

ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Proposed changes for Fiscal Years 2012 and 2013

**Option 1**
Advantages to moving the Knowledge (Technical Communities) portion of K&C to Institutes
1. Supports society revenue growth metrics through knowledge development (I.P.) and distribution
2. Reduces redundancies / sharing best practices
3. Aligns with .ORG strategy
4. Improves synergy between established Institutes and Technical Communities program
5. Provides strong entry point for technology engagement

**Option 2**
Advantages to moving the Knowledge (Technical Communities) to a new sector
1. Disseminate technical information
2. Focus on knowledge transfer
3. Develop new products and programs

**Advantages to merging the Community portion of K&C with Membership Services**
1. Supports society membership growth metrics by focusing on member value
2. Reduces redundancies / improves accountability
3. Opportunities to strengthen established working relationships
4. Strengthens communication channels
5. Reduces workload through distribution of strategic and operational issues across a larger group of volunteers
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization
Frequently Asked Questions

1. Why is this not the Council on Member Affairs/Council on Engineering Part 2?
   Since Continuity and Change, we’ve had many years to study and learn, with a focus on what has improved and what is in need of improvement. Many things have improved. We’re now at the tipping point where it’s time to address what needs to be improved.

   A. We’ve recognized that in the best organizations, volunteers and staff partner with volunteers focused on strategy and staff focused on operations

   B. We’ve recognized that the majority of our volunteers are directly involved with either Sections (physical and virtual) or Technical Divisions, usually not both—we need to use best practices and supply the resources needed to grow both areas.

   C. We’ve learned that we can not predict how people will want to interact even three years in the future—we need a flexible organization that can easily adapt.

   D. We’ve learned that some demographics prefer meeting face-to-face while others prefer virtual communities—we need to support both.

   E. We’ve learned that rapid growth in technology interest is occurring outside of North America—we need the Worldwide Community sector to focus on the needs of not only our traditional membership, but our future members.

F. Therefore:
   Phase 1 of 2 (FY 2011-2012): Redesign Affinity/Global Communities and restructure the Knowledge & Community sector into the Worldwide Community sector

   I. Simplify our mission, processes and structure—one of our members care about our internal issues, they just want to get things done or want to things to get done.

   II. Create an organization to support global growth—we need more volunteers engaged in leadership to do so.

   III. Actively engage with our grassroots members to help them engage at the worldwide level—we need to reach out to our grassroots membership and help those who may not even know about ASME at the worldwide level.
G. How
   Phase 1 of 2 (FY 2011-2012): Redesign Affinity/Global Communities and restructure the Knowledge & Community sector into the Worldwide Community sector
   I. Create more leadership roles while simultaneously not increasing net expenses.
      • Example: Wikipedia model (crowdsourcing): Increase revenue through the sale of organized and reviewed Intellectual Property developed during physical and virtual meetings. Focus these efforts into “bite size pieces” for volunteer teams primarily located in the virtual realm to keep costs in low.
   II. Communicate more frequently with physical and virtual section leaders. Help them to succeed and measure their success through metrics.
      • Example: How many mid-career and later members have held leadership roles beyond the section level in the last five years? Make this part of the merit based funding program.
      • If a particular leadership team is having difficulty for two consecutive fiscal years, bypass the team and reach out directly to the section’s membership.

H. Therefore
   Phase 2 of 2 (FY 2013): Technical Divisions + Institutes = Something New
   I. Select best practices from across the enterprise and external to the enterprise with a view toward: If we were to build a growing business around highly technical Intellectual Property (IP) and the events to support the creation and distribution of this IP:
      • Who are our customers?
      • What would the organization look like?
      • Who would do what?
   I. How: Phase 2 of 2 (FY 2013): Technical Divisions + Institutes = Something New
      I. Stay tuned, the taskforces are working.
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Frequently Asked Questions

2. What happens to District Leaders?
   The specific position will be sunset. Many leadership opportunities will exist within the new Worldwide Community Sector.

3. How do Sections and Affinities receive service and support?
   Through the newly created Membership Committee.

4. What happens to Students?
   K&C related student committees and programs are currently proposed to be transferred to the new Student/Early Career Sector.

5. How will the new Sector be funded?
   Reallocation of resources. Increase in funding will be needed during the transition fiscal year of 2013. Funding request process via the BOG and COFI.

6. How will the leadership transition be handled?
   A. For Vice Presidents (VPs); a modified process based on the Sr. Vice President selection process will be used for the first iteration (Refer to “VP Selection Process slide”). Subsequent VPs will go through the standard Nominating Committee process.
      i. Except for the VP Technical Communities, all present VPs, incoming VP, and the two VPs selected by the FY2012 Nominating Committee will be sunset.
      ii. VP of Global Communities will transition to the Chair of the Membership Committee.
      iii. VP of Programs and Activities will transition to the Chair of the Content Development Committee.
      iv. Communications Committee (standing) will be sunset.
      v. Committee on Rules and Governance (standing) will be retained.
   B. Committee Chairs will be appointed by the Sector’s Board.
   C. Sr. Vice President to be nominated via the standard process (no changes).
   D. K&C Leaders (VP, VP elect, Committee Chair) will be given the opportunity to run for new Vice President and Committee Chair positions along with other applicants.

7. Is K&C creating new Vice President (VP) positions?
   K&C presently has five (5) VP positions. We are re-titling those five positions.
8. **What happens to Technical Communities during Fiscal Year (FY 2013)?**
   Originally slated to start and be completed by FY2013 (K&C Redesign Phase 2 of 2), per the timeline approved by the Board of Governors during 2012 April, both the K&C Strategy Taskforce and the K&C/Institutes Taskforce have begun their work early.
   Scenarios:
   A. If the taskforces complete their recommendation in time for the 2012 June Board of Governor’s meeting, then Technical Communities will be included in changes recommended during FY2012.
   B. The likelier scenario is that Technical Communities will remain within the Worldwide Sector during FY2013.
      I. This means that the Worldwide Community sector will temporarily have six (6) Vice Presidents during FY2013.

9. **How will these changes affect the Worldwide Community sector’s Nominating Committee (NC) representation?**
   A. No changes will be required to the number of our NC representation during FY2013
   B. While no candidates from the Worldwide Community sector will come before the NC during FY 2013, our sector will continue to participate in the selection of society officers.
   C. Our five (5) NC representatives will be re-titled during FY2013.
   D. As discussed with the NC, although unlikely, the Worldwide Community sector may need to change one or more of its NC representatives during FY2013.

10. **What happens if Membership Services does not combine with the Worldwide Community Sector?**
    Our sector will continue with all aspects of the reorganization. But, there would need to be improved communication coordination between Membership Services and the Worldwide Community Sector.

11. **Does the Worldwide Community Sector expect to absorb the ASME’s staff offices located outside of America?**
    Our sector expects to work closely with the other sectors and our staff partners throughout the world. Coordinating of working relationships between the sectors is expected to continue via the Sector Management Committee (SMC). The SMC includes both volunteer and staff leaders.

12. **What happens if the Institutes Sector rejects the proposed merger of Technical Communities with Institutes?**
    Our sector will propose that Technical Communities becomes a new sector separate from the new Worldwide Community Sector.

13. **How will the Community Sector work with VOLT?**
    A committee within the Worldwide Sector will be established to work with VOLT in order to determine the Sector’s training needs and how to meet them.
### ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

#### Frequently Asked Questions

14. How do we ensure that the VPs don’t create silos?
   - The present, successful, operating process used by K&C’s board will be carried over to the Worldwide Community board.
   - A. Board includes Sr. VP, VPs, key staff
   - B. Monthly board teleconferences
   - C. Three face-to-face meetings with the board per fiscal year (Annual meeting, IMECE, Worldwide Community retreat).
   - D. Weekly teleconferences with Sr. VP and Staff
   - E. Sr. VP part of Sector Management Committee

   Improvements include:
   - A. Board focuses on strategy to implement Board of Governors and Sector Management goals.
   - B. Each Vice President is directly responsible for coordinating and reporting the operations of a specific group of committees.
   - C. By reducing the reporting layers, the Worldwide Community board is closer to our grassroots members in order to understand new initiatives. Also, response delays due to hierarchy are significantly reduced.

15. What is the Vice President’s job description?
   - A. Develop strategies for membership growth throughout their engagement area
   - B. Coordinate with other Worldwide Community sector VPs on sector strategic issues
   - C. Delegate operational issues to the Committee Chairs
   - D. Listen to grassroots membership feedback
   - E. Advise the board on opportunities to work with other sectors

16. What does “Locally Relevant/Accessible Content/Intellectual Property” mean? Who is going to create it? How is this different from Technical Division’s Intellectual Property (IP)?
   - **Issue 1:** Whether at virtual meetings or face-to-face meetings, content is being created all of the time. Even great ideas are usually lost because we don’t have a good method of capturing, sorting, indexing, reviewing and distributing the material. This is a significantly different model for creating IP than the one used by Technical Divisions. It’s the business of Wikipedia (Sections/Affinities) versus that of Britannica (Technical Divisions).
   - **Issue 2:** It’s been estimated that 20% of this information applies to all of our physical and virtual communities. But we don’t have a method or the workforce to analyze what is relevant and what is not. So we tend to blast out E-mails to everyone that are then discarded before being read.

   **Proposed solution:** By combining crowdsourcing, a database, and recognition for authoring and editing, this enormous task is broken into bite-size pieces that small volunteer teams or individuals can address as they have time.
## ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

### K&C Board and Taskforce Members*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom Libertiny</td>
<td>K&amp;C Sr. VP, Global Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Bunce</td>
<td>K&amp;C VP, Global Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip Carpentier</td>
<td>K&amp;C VP, Programs &amp; Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shekhar Chandrashekhar</td>
<td>ASME Staff (prior member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marianne Chan</td>
<td>K&amp;C Chair, Rules &amp; Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burt Dicht</td>
<td>ASME Staff (prior member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip DiVietro</td>
<td>ASME Staff (prior member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC de la Garza</td>
<td>K&amp;C VP, Affinity Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Dubac</td>
<td>Member, Student Section Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noha El-Ghobashy</td>
<td>ASME Staff (prior member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luc Geraets</td>
<td>K&amp;C VP Elect, Technical Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindy Grinnan</td>
<td>K&amp;C VP, Technical Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hieu Hart</td>
<td>Past K&amp;C VP, Global Communities (prior member)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ireland</td>
<td>Managing Director, Engineering Research &amp; Technology Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joy Liu</td>
<td>ECLIPSE Intern to K&amp;C Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarad Oehring</td>
<td>K&amp;C Chair, Communications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Ohland</td>
<td>K&amp;C VP, Financial Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raj Manchanda</td>
<td>Director, Emerging Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elio Manes</td>
<td>Director, Leadership &amp; Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Michaud</td>
<td>Managing Director, Global Alliances, International Relations Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Marboe</td>
<td>K&amp;C VP Elect, Programs &amp; Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey Swisher Harnetty</td>
<td>PA&amp;O Sr. VP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Taskforce members are regularly rotated to maximize inclusiveness.

### Worldwide Community Sector—Example Operating Boards

#### Structure: Robust flexibility.

- **Customer:** Group units leaders
- **Mission of sector infrastructure:** Help our customers to create locally accessible Intellectual Content and communication channels (example: events); and to provide networking opportunities

#### Operating Board (voting members): 1 Sr. VP, 5 VP’s, 2 Members-at-Large

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board focus</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee focus</td>
<td>Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP focus</td>
<td>Business Development/Growth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VP North America A*, B**</th>
<th>VP South America C, D</th>
<th>VP Asia E, F</th>
<th>VP Europe &amp; Middle East G, H</th>
<th>VP Virtual Engagement I, J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair A** Membership</td>
<td>Sections, Affinity, Membership (staff)</td>
<td>4***</td>
<td>2***</td>
<td>2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Chair B** Content Development</td>
<td>Locally relevant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In this example: VP North America would be responsible for coordinating A and B.

**Additional Committees can be added.

***In this example: Membership Committee would be required to have the listed demographic makeup.
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Budget Implications for Fiscal Year 2013

Knowledge—Technical Communities
• Dependent on outcome of Technical Communities redesign; either as a part of Institutes or a new sector.

Community—Global/Affinity Communities
• Approximately $120K one-time increase
  • Support for transitioning programs
  • Support of meetings for K&C Sector redesign
  • Retention of topical experts (consultants)
• If ASME I.T. is unable to support web-tool development within a designated time frame, budget needed for using external firms

Student/Early Career Sector
• Transfer of assets to new sector

ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Considerations and Mitigations

Transition of Sections to new Membership Committee
Consideration #1
• Possible alienation of our Section Leaders
• Mitigation
  • Implement Engagement and Communication Strategy
  • Reasonable inclusiveness of key stakeholders in recommendations
  • Acknowledgement that we won’t be able to please 100% of our members

Consideration #2
• Leaders potentially displaced
• Mitigation
  • New Worldwide Community Sector will need more volunteers than at present—more opportunities for volunteer engagement
  • New Student/Early Career Sector will need volunteer Leaders
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

Resources

- Interface of web-tools with membership database
- Right people in the right place

Starting and Sunsetting Committees in the Future—Process: Flexible and Adaptable

Starting

1. Champion (potential future Chair of committee) selects topic of interest
2. Finds a minimum of 5 interested parties from the required demographics
3. Identifies a potential sponsoring Worldwide Community Sector Vice President
4. Sends simple, one page business plan to the Sector Board:
   A. Name of officers
   B. Mission
   C. Estimated staff requirements
   D. Estimated financial requirements
5. Sector Board review for strategic fit
6. Board determines Go/No-go/Suggestions for improvement

Automatic Sunsetting

1. If Committee is not able to maintain minimum number of 5 interested members from the required demographics, the Sector Board places the Committee on a probation period of one fiscal year. (Monitored by the responsible VP and staff).
2. After one fiscal year, if Committee remains under minimum member/demographic criteria then the Committee is automatically sunset.
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Proposed New Organization

VP Selection Process—Phase 1 (2013)*

Call for Five Vice Presidents
Across Enterprise by K&C Rules and Governance Committee
[standard Sr. VP process]

Candidate Vetting**
K&C Board voting members (Sr. VP, 5 VP’s, 2 Committee Chairs), K&C senior staff, one representative from each of the 3 Sectors

Candidate Selection
K&C Board voting members (Sr. VP, 5 VP’s, 2 Committee Chairs)
[standard Sr. VP process]

Candidate Approval
Board of Governors
[standard Sr. VP process]

*VP term lengths:
1) One VP: 2 years, ending FY 2014
2) Two VP’s: 3 years, ending FY 2015
3) Two VP’s: 4 years, ending FY 2016

**Modification to standard Sr. VP process.
**Demonstrated understanding:
1) K&C strategic plan
2) How to work with staff counterparts, particularly in VP’s geographic growth areas

**Demonstrated experience:
1) Strategic planning
2) Global market growth within VP’s geographic area
3) Experience in VP’s geographic growth area

**Location:
1) Ideally candidates are located or have experience in their geographic growth area
Date Submitted: March 28, 2012  
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) Student and Early Career Task Force; Public Affairs & Outreach and Knowledge & Community Sectors
Presented by: Stacey Swisher Harnetty, Tom Libertiny and Cynthia Stong
Agenda Title: Proposed New Sector for Students and Early Career

Agenda Item Executive Summary: *(Do not exceed the space provided)*

A presentation will be made on a proposed new sector to champion the interests and programs of students and early career engineers.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: *(if appropriate)*
Action is requested to approve the following Motion:

To endorse the proposal of the Student and Early Career Task Force to establish a new Student and Early Career Sector, and to direct COR to bring required proposed bylaw revisions to the BOG for action in June.

Attachments:
One
Why create a new sector?

In April 2011 BOG had supported the creation of a taskforce to consider the creation of a new Sector which will

- Meet the needs and provide a voice for students and early career engineers
- Provide advocacy leadership for students and early career engineers
- Create opportunities for students and early career engineers to influence the “path forward” for ASME
What is a composition of the taskforce team?

Volunteer Team

Cynthia Stong, PAO – Leader
Jen Jewers Bowlin, PAO
Yash Gupta, K&C
Stacey Swisher Harnetty, PAO
Tom Libertiny, K&C
Twish Mehta, K&C
Karen Ohland, K&C
Nathan Taylor, PAO
Jessica Townsend, K&C
Yannick Gindroz, K&C
Carlos Beatty, K&C

Staff Team

Tatyana Polyak, PAO
Shekhar Chandrashekhar, PAO
Marian Heller, K&C
Tom Perry, PAO
Madhu Rangi, PAO

Who are the stakeholders?

- Internal stakeholders contacted by the taskforce team:
  - Public Affairs & Outreach
    - Board on Students & Early Career
      - Old Guard Committee
      - Committee on Early Career Development
      - Committee on Student Development
        - Student Design Competition Committee
        - HPVIC Committee
  - Knowledge & Communities
    - Global Communities Operating Board
    - Student Sections Committee
    - Programs & Activities Operating Board
    - Affinity Groups Operating Board
      - International Outreach Affinity Group

- External stakeholders
What are the data sources to identify the needs?

1. SPDC Future Models Team report
2. Vision 2030 Survey results for Students and for ECEs
3. Internal assessment of ASME programs for students and ECEs
4. Discussion with the international Student & ECE communities’ representatives

What are proposed sector’s Mission and Vision?

➢ Mission:

Providing a voice for students and early career engineers and creating opportunities to influence ASME “path forward”

➢ Vision:

To become a gateway of choice for engineering students and early career engineers, building a successful professional career in Engineering enabled by sustained engagement in ASME over all career stages
What are the strategic goals?

**Identified Students and Early Career Engineers Needs:**
- Career development venues, content & resources.
- Ongoing career development throughout all career stages.
- Leadership skills development venues.
- Inclusive and diverse Student community.
- Innovative programs for students in partnership with other organizations.
- Consistent marketing and communication messages and effective content delivery channels.

**Sector Strategic Goals:**

- **Career development:** Facilitate professional development, mentoring, networking and career management to bridge the gap between engineering education and the engineering workforce.
- **Recognition & Leadership:** Foster a more inclusive and diverse student engineering community by providing an opportunity for students & ECEs to get engaged through governance & leadership positions & by recognizing their contribution.
- **Student Programs:** Develop innovative programs for students.
- **Innovation, Communication & Partnership:** Build right partnerships with local schools and organizations to sponsor and grow new programs.

What is a proposed composition of the Sector Council?

- **Student and Early Career Development Sector Council**
  - Committee on Partnerships
  - Committee on Global Perspective
  - Committee on Communication & Marketing
  - Board on Career Development
  - Board on Student Programs
  - Board on Leadership & Recognition
When we succeed, what difference will it make?

- **Serve as a voice to students and early career engineers** with representation by experienced engineers, early career engineers and students
- **Provide a gateway for students and early career engineers** to engage and advance their career
- **Present opportunities** for students & early career engineers to intermingle with each other and experienced engineers while working on mutually important projects
- **Facilitate cross-sector collaboration** by including experienced engineers from other ASME communities in the new Sector Boards and Committees
- **Spearhead coordinated program development** geared towards student and early career development needs
- **Enable innovation** for new program development by increased communication and collaboration

How are we going to mitigate the challenges?

- Independence from other sectors may create an island environment and isolation
  - **Linkages to and collaboration with other ASME sectors and communities** will help mitigate risk of becoming an island as well as representation from all demographics
- Disruption of existing “best practices”
  - **Support and endorsement of established successful relationships** will become part of the strategic plan for going forward
- Overpromising on the results
  - **Strategic planning and progress tracking** will help develop realistic plans for growth and balance the resources
  - **Ongoing communication with the stakeholders** will manage expectations and set the priorities
What is leadership transition plan?

1. Leaders with terms extending past June 2012 recommended by the Nominating Committee will be mapped to area that best meets mission and vision of elected position.

2. If they choose not to serve in new capacity, another leader will be selected with a task force member serving as a transition advisor.

3. Selection of new leaders will be proposed by the taskforce and approved by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council and K&C Sector Board with attention to possibilities of near term elections and a manageable turnover of sector board leadership.

4. Elect leadership of committees and task forces as we currently do today.
New Sector Formation Primary Goals

Providing a voice for students and early career engineers and creating opportunities to influence ASME “path forward”

Get It Right!

Proposed BOG Motion

To endorse the proposal of the Student and Early Career Task Force to establish a new Student and Early Career Sector, and to direct COR to bring required proposed bylaw revisions to the BOG for action in June.
Appendix

Stakeholders feedback

Opportunities

1. Consider a committee that focuses on the competitions in the new sector structure
2. Provide more transparency in sponsorship funds allocation for competitions
3. Offer centralized help in fundraising
4. Provide better marketing and communication of the competitions
5. Increase the number of teams participating in competitions
6. Develop strategies to use competitions as a vehicle to attract students to join ASME as members
7. Introduce new activities for early career engineers
8. Develop well-structured mentoring programs for ECEs
9. Offer clear path on finding leadership opportunities within ASME
10. Engage in social-professional forums like LinkedIn or Facebook to share what is going on in personal and professional life
11. Create more networking opportunities between ECEs
12. Increase exposure to people and information about a range of industries to widen employment perspectives and networking
13. Develop forum to connect engineers with entrepreneurs and innovators
14. Offer easy access to technical divisions
15. Introduce a platform with more services for graduate students
16. Make sure students sections advisors are included in the process as they provide a continuity component for the Student Sections and have a broader view of how student sections work
17. Consider this new Sector as a major growth potential for ASME
18. Consider giving student members a more prominent voice and participation in decision making, voting and nominating processes
Stakeholders feedback

Risks
1. Avoid repeats of the former Centers and K&C experience on communication gaps and confusion about roles and responsibilities for student programs
2. Recognize that a transition from student member to full member is a considerable effort
3. Do not lose sight and bring attention to Latin America and other global communities and districts which are already big and growing
4. Carefully consider the scope of work for the new Sector to avoid an overlap with lots of other ASME activities are in the space of career development from K&C to S&C
5. Pay close attention to the people who are not on a purely technical track and not on a purely business management path but are in the middle
6. Consider including more applied sessions for IMECE
7. Important to partner with other organizations
8. Recognize that membership fees prevent many international and graduate students from joining ASME
9. Consider special rates to assess library content - outside the scope of work for the taskforce
10. Avoid developing a complicated hierarchical organizational structure for new Sector - outside the scope of work for the taskforce

Alignment of the Existing Committees to the New Sector Structure
Mapping of Existing Programs to the New Sector Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Programs in PAO &amp; K&amp;C</th>
<th>Outcomes of the Taskforce assessment at the retreat</th>
<th>Student &amp; Early Career Development Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Career Forums and Graduate Students Technical Conferences (K&amp;C)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>Board on Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webcasts for Early Career Engineers (PAO, new program)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>Committee on Early Career Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME Today E-Newsletter (PAO)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Leadership Seminars</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>Board on Leadership and Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles T. Main Award (K&amp;C, PAO, ASME)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Divisions and Institutes Awards (K&amp;C, Institutes)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faces of Engineering program (PAO)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Action Board (PAO)</td>
<td>Revamp by New Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District level Student Professional Development Conferences (K&amp;C)</td>
<td>Revamp by New Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Sections Programs &amp; Activities (K&amp;C)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District and Society level Old Guard Oral Competition (K&amp;C/PAO)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District level Old Guard Web Design Competition (K&amp;C)</td>
<td>Revamp by New Sector and substitute with Design Review &amp; EXPO</td>
<td>Board on Student Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District level Old Guard Poster Competition (K&amp;C)</td>
<td>Revamp by New Sector and substitute with Design Review &amp; EXPO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District level Student (K&amp;C) and society level Student Design Competitions (K&amp;C, PAO)</td>
<td>M&amp;G, to evaluate and transition to New Sector</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Section Committee</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District level Rapid Design Challenge (pilot) at SPDC (K&amp;C)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Powered Vehicle Challenge (PAO)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Showcase (PAO)</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keep</td>
<td>evaluate</td>
<td>keep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the examples of Society-wide bridges?

**ASME Sector/Communities**

**Standards & Certification**
- Collaborating with S&C on developing codes training programs
- Collaborating with Membership, Marketing and ASME.org on refining online Engineering career building tools and developing consistent marketing messages
- Teaming up with Membership and Marketing on creating Student leadership opportunities with affinity groups and local sections
- Teaming up with technical divisions on developing new programs for students
- Working with PAO & Public Information on popularizing ASME programs for students

**Membership & Marketing**
- Collaborating with Publishing on providing relevant publications for engineering career growth
- Working with Publishing on providing relevant publications for engineering career growth
- Working with VOLT on new leadership development programs
- Working with EGD on creating Student leadership positions globally

**Publishing**
- Working with Publishing on providing relevant publications for engineering career growth
- Working with Publishing on providing relevant publications for engineering career growth
- Working with VOLT on new leadership development programs
- Working with EGD on creating Student leadership positions globally

**K&C/Institutes**
- Teaming up with K&C & Institutes on improving networking venues at technical conferences and events
- Working with VOLT on new leadership development programs
- Working with PAO & Public Information on popularizing ASME programs for students

**VOLT**
- Working with Education Board on a feedback loop for engineering education at colleges
- Working with VOLT on new leadership development programs
- Working with PAO & Public Information on popularizing ASME programs for students

**PAO**
- Working with Education Board on a feedback loop for engineering education at colleges
- Working with VOLT on new leadership development programs
- Working with PAO & Public Information on popularizing ASME programs for students

**Student & Early Career Development Sector**
- Committee on Communication & Marketing
- Committee on Global Perspectives
- Committee on Partnerships
- Board on Career Development
- Board on Recognition & Leadership
- Board on Student Programs
Process to Form a New Program Committee

1. Identifying the Need for a New Program Committee
   - Committee on Partnerships or Global Perspective Identifies Need
   - Existing Program Committee, Board, or Council Identifies New Program
   - Volunteer(s) Demonstrate Interest in Developing New Program

2. Creating the New Program Committee
   - Need for New Program Committee Identified
   - Recommending Group prepares Business Plan & Proposal to recommending Board and/or Council.
   - Recommending Group develops business plan to present to recommending Board and Sector Council, including proposed Initial Volunteer Team members.
   - Recommending Group presents Proposal to Sector Council.

3. New Program Committee Approval
   - Sector Council reviews Proposal, in the context of existing programs and resources available.
   - If it approves, Sector Council assigns New Program Committee to the most relevant Board.
   - Recommending Group and Initial Team develop Bylaws & Operating Guide. New Committee begins operating with Initial Volunteer Team, with Chair reporting to assigned Board.

Process to Sunset Program Committee

1. Identifying the need to sunset Program Committee
   - Existing Program Committee or Board recommends sunsetting a Program Committee
   - Feedback and/or Assessment indicates need to sunset program

2. Sunsetting Program Committee
   - Need to Sunset Program Committee Identified
   - Recommending Group creates Sunset Proposal, including rationale for sunsetting and recommendation for any needed replacement program(s).
   - Recommending Group presents Sunset Proposal to Board. If Board approves, presents Sunset Proposal to the Sector Council.
   - If it approves, Sector Council disbands Program Committee, acknowledges service of Committee Members, and archives ByLaws and Operating Guide.
New Committee Business Plan Template

Business Plan Template
Submitted by:
Date of submission:
Proposed Committee Chair:
Proposed Committee Title:

The complete document should be no more than 2 pages in total.

**Brief description** of proposed committee purpose (one paragraph):

**List all goals** for committee as definable outcomes. Please include immediate and long-term goals.
- For the students/early career engineers
- For the society

How do the goals of this committee align with or support the sector goals and objectives? *(Review the goals and objectives here)*

**Rationale:** Explain the need for this committee. Does it fill a gap or support existing programs/events/resources? Why is this strategic for the Student & EC Sector?

**Resources** for the committee: Please list under each heading where appropriate.
- Desired committee member’s interests and experience
- Vital connections to other ASME units & communities
- Proposed committee place in S&EC sector structure (reporting to board/committee)

**Committee Formation Timeline:** Outline time period and key benchmarks from planning stage to realization and evaluation.

**Evaluation Plan:** How will you know if you were successful? Describe how you will measure the outcomes:
- Qualitatively
- Quantitatively

Reviewed by: ________________________________ date: ________________
Approved by: ________________________________ date: ________________
Date Submitted: April 2, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) K&C Energy Indicators Scorecard Project Steering Committee
Presented by: Richard Laudenat
Agenda Title: Energy Indicators Scorecard

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

A brief update on the Energy Indicators Scorecard project’s progress to date, and the planning considerations for the next step.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)
None

Attachments: Power Point Presentation
ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard

Next Steps

Richard Laudenat, BOG Elect, Chair, Energy Indicators Steering Committee
Board of Governors Meeting
April 19, 2012
New York

ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard Project Objectives

• Develop an ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard report card on the “The State of America’s Energy System” that covers the full spectrum of the Energy Value Chain
• Project is a continuation of the Energy Grand Challenge Roadmap
• Project target audiences are Policy Makers and the General Public
Energy Value Chain ... revisited

ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard: Strategic Objectives

• Support a more informed national dialogue on energy through the development of the ASME Energy Indicators
• Increase ASME’s profile as “an essential energy technology resource and as a leading energy policy advocate”
• Provide an informed and unbiased assessment of the U.S. Energy Sector
• Provides new web-based content
Existing Indicator Models:

- ASCE Infrastructure Report Card
- NIST Baseline Profiles – Includes Energy
- NSF Science and Engineering Indicators

ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard: 
Workshop

- Held September 13-14, 2011 in Washington, D.C.
- More than 35 ASME volunteers, staff members, and other energy experts participated
- Solicited participants’ views on the scope, structure, and process by which ASME could complete an energy indicators scorecard
- Tom Loughlin and Vickie Rockwell led off the Workshop
ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard: Workshop Report Results

- Finalized set of energy indicators as the framework for the potential scorecard
- Proposed scoring criteria and scoring methodologies for each of the indicators

ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard: Workshop Report Results

- Identified key considerations for the scoring process,
  - Volunteer and staff roles,
  - Responsibilities, timing, frequency, & Resources required
- Developed preliminary elements of a communication plan
- Proposed project plan outlined
ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard:
Energy Sector Components

- Energy Sources
  - Coal
  - Wind
  - Natural Gas
  - Geothermal
  - Petroleum
  - Hydro
  - Nuclear
  - Biomass
  - Solar
  - Ocean
  - Waste to Energy

- Derived Energy Products
  - Electricity Generation
  - Liquid Fuels Production
  - Gaseous Fuels Production
  - Process Heat

- Energy Use
  - Pipelines
  - Electric Grid
  - Thermal Grid
  - Rail, Truck, Ship
  - Residential
  - Commercial
  - Transportation
  - Industrial

CROSSCUTTING ISSUES
- Storage
- Energy Education
- Energy R&D

ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard:
Scorecard Example
XYZ Energy Sector Component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. ENERGY SECTOR</th>
<th>GRADE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Acceptance</td>
<td>GRADE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. ENERGY SECTOR</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>C ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>B ↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Impact</td>
<td>D ↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>C ↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Acceptance</td>
<td>B ↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard: Scorecard Detail

ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard Project “Next Steps”

- Recommendation from the Energy Indicators Steering Committee – Phase I
  - ASME should develop a “beta” version of the scorecard process that pilots one of the energy indicators through the entire scorecard process.
  - Allows ASME to “learn by doing,” providing lessons learned that can be used to streamline later implementation of the entire scorecard structure and process.
ASME Energy Indicators Scorecard
Project “Next Steps”

• Phase I (cont.)

– Entails forming one Energy Indicator working group consisting of 10–15 experts from ASME staff, volunteers, and external experts.
– Fossil energy may be an appropriate topic for this working group, given ASME’s expertise in fossil energy.
– “Beta” version will take about a year.
– Allows informed decision making on long term project.

Questions … ?
Date Submitted: March 5, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) PAO
Presented by: Vickie Rockwell & Michael Cowan
Agenda Title: Summary of Engineers Week 2012

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

As Chair of Engineers Week 2012, ASME led a wide range of activities. These included conceiving, developing and implementing three key initiatives:

1. Expansion of the Inspire Innovation Workshops
2. Creation of the DiscoverE Educator Awards
3. DiscoverE Summit

This Summary, presented by ASME President Vickie Rockwell and Michael Cowan, Director of Public Information, will review highlights from Engineers Week and provide an overview of communications impact and metrics.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Attachments:

PowerPoint Presentation
Engineers Week 2012

- Overview
- Program Highlights
- Communications
- Metrics
- Moving Forward
OVERVIEW

Team Members

- Vickie Rockwell
- Marc Goldsmith
- Bob Simmons
- Ed Harvego
- Tom Loughlin
- Phil Hamilton
- Michael Cowan
- Melissa Carl
- Edie Ervin
- Wil Haywood
- Elio Manes
- Tom Perry
- Madhu Rangi
- Patti Jo Snyder
- Gemma Tansey
EWeek Programs

- Future City Competition
- Essays on the theme "Fuel Your Future"
- Introduce a Girl to Engineering
- Family Day
- New Faces of Engineering
- New Faces College Edition
- Global Marathon
- Inspire Innovation Workshops
- DiscoverE Educator Recognition Awards
- DiscoverE Summit

PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS
Inspire Innovation Workshops

- Q2: Denver, Idaho
- Q3: Houston, Clearwater Beach, New York
- Q4: Las Vegas, Montreal
- YTD: Participation by 177 teachers along with 48 engineers
- Teachers consistently give the workshop a 9 out of 10 rating for instructional value, engineering career awareness, and quality of engineer interaction.

The DiscoverE Summit

Creating a new forum for engineering volunteers, educators, and mentors

- 132 registrants/attendees
- 85 percent of these were leaders and volunteers from other engineering societies and organizations
The Inaugural DiscoverE Educator Recognition Awards

- ASME received 187 Nominations
- Three first place winners, eight runners up, and twelve Honorable Mentions
The DiscoverE Educator Recognition Awards:

Shella Rivano Condino

2012 DiscoverE Educator Award Presented to
Shella Rivano Condino
Presidio High School, Presidio, TX

The DiscoverE Educator Recognition Awards:

Derek Sale

2012 DiscoverE Educator Award Presented to
Derek Sale
Paul Robeson Malcolm X Academy, Detroit, MI
The DiscoverE Educator Recognition Awards:

Javaris Powell

2012 DiscoverE Educator Award Presented to

Javaris Powell

Friendship Public Charter School, Washington, DC

Family Day 2012

- 9,500 kids, parents, and teachers attended Family Day
- Volunteers at the ASME booth: Four engineering students, three high school technology students, one engineer
• 30 ASME volunteers served as judges

The Global Marathon for, by, and About Women in Engineering and Technology
COMMUNICATIONS

ASME.org: An EWeek nexus for students, educators and engineers
Leveraging New Media

ASME President Victoria Rockwell’s EWeek STEM Podcast hit the target

Targeted E-mail Blasts
ASME.org: EWeek Training Videos

Social Networking
Laying the groundwork in January
ASME News:
Getting out the word about EWeek

That’s Engineering

ASME:

AGENDA APPENDIX 2.5.4
Page 14 of 19
Daily print circulation: 1,829,099 for the period ending March 31, 2011.
Coverage in Discover Magazine

Circulation: 6.7 million readers (web/print)

The Dallas Morning News:
Eight Page EWeek Sunday Special Section

Reaching 339,000 readers daily
Metrics

Data Science

- 2,670 non-Future City print clips
- Nearly 950 million impressions about Future City
- 10,000 tweets about Engineers Week

Volunteers

- Distribution of Eweek kits up by 22%
- Distribution of Introduce a Girl to Engineering Day kits up by 32%
- Annual bookmark distribution up by 36%

Outreach

- More than 55,000 engineers work with 5.5 million K-12 students and educators in general outreach
- 10,000 engineers support 1 million girls in K-12 for Girl Day
- School registrations for Future City up by 20%
- Widespread use of 2012 Eweek theme “7 Billion people, 7 Billion dreams. Engineers turn dreams into reality.”
Metrics

Inspire Innovation Workshops:
- YTD 177 teachers and 48 engineers participated
- Teachers rated the workshop 9 out of 10 for instructional value, engineering career awareness, and quality of engineer interaction

DiscoverE Educator Awards:
- 187 nominated
- 3 first place winners, 8 runners up, and 12 Honorable Mentions

DiscoverE Summit:
- 132 registrants/attendees
- 112 of these were from outside of ASME

Family Day:
- 9,500 kids, parents, teachers at Family Day.
- Volunteers at the ASME booth – 4 engineering students, 3 high school technology students, one engineer.

Future City:
- 30 ASME volunteers served as judges

Global Marathon
- Nearly 2,000 registrants from 71 countries

SEO: ASME.org is the second Google result for the search term “Engineers Week 2012”
- Eweek page received 5,020 views
- Educator Awards received 2,092 views
MOVING FORWARD

- Potential EWeek legacy and ASME Pre-College Program (DiscoverE Educator Awards)
- Lessons Learned and Building a Bridge to our Pre-College Education programming
- Leveraging the “That’s Engineering” brand
- Building on partnership with DISCOVER
ASME Board of Governors
Agenda Item
Cover Memo

Date Submitted: April 3rd
BOG Meeting Date: April 19th

To: Board of Governors
From: COFI / ASME Finance
Presented by: Reginald Vachon / Michael Weis
Agenda Title: Update on 2013-2015 Budget Development

Agenda Item Executive Summary:

COFI met on May 22nd and May 23rd to review the budget development with SMC and staff.

Mike Weis will provide an update to the Board of Governors on the status of the budget process as presented to COFI in March.

Proposed motion for BOG Action:

none

Attachments:

FY13 Budget Analysis April 2012 BOG.ppt
COFI Report To BOG
Finances & 2013-15 Budget

Reggie Vachon, Chair, COFI

BOG Meeting
New York City
April 19-20, 2012

FY12 Q2 Financial Summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budget ($M)</th>
<th>YTD ($M)</th>
<th>Forecast ($M)</th>
<th>Variance ($M)</th>
<th>Variance %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rev:</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp:</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net:</td>
<td>(0.8)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FY12 Finances - Update

February Year-to-Date
- Revenue unfavorable ($0.4M)
- Expense favorability $5.5M primarily Conformity Assessment, Publishing and staffing costs

December Forecast
- Revenue favorability $0.5M driven primarily by Publishing
- Expense favorable $1.8M

FY12 Investments and Non-Operating - Update

- Investments thru February up 2.4%
  - Investment markets have improved steadily since September 2011
- Non-operating expenses of $4.9M
  - Includes IPTI contribution expense, Initiative spending and ASME.org and CA Connect development costs
COFI/SMC March 22-23 Meeting

- SMC: Responsibility for operations aligned with Society strategy as assigned by BOG.
- COFI: Responsibility for ASME finances as assigned by BOG.
  - Development of 3-Year Balanced Budget
- COFI & SMC Joint Effort: DRAFT resource allocation through budget development & presentation to BOG

An Enterprise Approach

- **Mission:** To serve diverse global communities by advancing, disseminating and applying engineering knowledge for improving the quality of life; and communicating the excitement of engineering.

- Financial Landscape
  - Past performance
  - Investing in the Future

- **FY 13 Budget Analysis** – Another way of looking at the numbers from an enterprise perspective
ASME Net - 5 Year History

Two primary take-aways:
• ASME financial health is heavily tied to S&C
• Corporate Support includes most of the infrastructure investments

Investing in the Future

Cost of Doing Business
• asme.org
• Infrastructure investment – facilities, XML (Digital Path), IT systems
• Intellectual property protection (e.g. anti-piracy; standards incorporated by reference challenge; protection of ASME registered trademarks globally)

Organizational Growth
• Energy (portfolio growth especially in new technologies and applications)
• Global Impact (offices, E4C, trade facilitation, technology transfer)
• Workforce development (e.g. personnel credentialing, student engagement)
• Potential acquisitions (for content, for membership, for mission)
Enterprise Budget Analysis Approach

- Looks at revenue generation and utilization from an ASME as-a-whole perspective
- Provides COFI and BOG a clearer picture of allocation of resources and improves ability to deploy financial resources consistent with strategic and infrastructure priorities
- Looks at staffing from an enterprise basis which, in turn, enables Executive Director deployment of positions across the enterprise consistent with strategic and infrastructure priorities
- Ensures that investment in the future, cost of doing business, and optimizing operational efficiencies are appropriately prioritized and funded
- Supports COFI and BOG fulfillment of fiduciary responsibilities by providing a level-set approach to allocation of resources.

FY13 Budget Approach

- FY 13 Baseline Budget
  1. Establish preliminary total enterprise revenue
  2. Calculate total staff compensation and benefits expense for existing, open, and requested FTE adds; establish and apply preliminary vacancy/managed approach percentage and subtract from total
  3. Calculate total fixed expenses of rent, depreciation, and amortization
  4. Calculate preliminary controllable expenses by starting with last four quarters actual (i.e. calendar year 2011) and add 3% inflationary factor (for FY13 baseline budget). Adjust for cyclic variations and revenue-based pluses/minus for adjusted baseline
  5. Separately quantify and identify what additional resources are being requested/needed.
FY 13 Budget Approach

• Allocate Remaining Resources based on strategic and infrastructure priorities (modify adjusted baseline budget if and as needed)
• Review other non-operating line budget items (e.g. capital equipment, initiative fund)
• FY 13 Proposed Budget prepared for BOG action.

Observations

• We have a first draft of the budget as in past years with a deficit – we have been here before
• FY14 starts the first year of the 2 year Boiler Code cycle
• New Public Affairs & Outreach (PAO) in its 1st of implementation
  – Includes the new Engineering for Global Development department.
• Need to better prioritize, allocate, and repurpose funding for longer term success, sustainability, and growth of ASME
• A new model is proposed for VOLT
• New Digital Library for journals with a “state of the art” platform
Observations

• Technical Divisions & Institutes continue to add to their custodial funds (from both operations & investments)
  – Should some of these monies go toward ASME’s operations and investment towards growth??

• Most conference revenues/expenses are not included in the operating budget; and as such are not included in this perspective

• Not all net surpluses remain in the operating budget and as such are not available for enterprise utilization (i.e. custodial funds)

• Current custodial model needs revisiting

Observations

• The goal of consistent reporting across the organization is progressing with the Uniform Reporting Task Force

• Still considering the move to a 5 year planning process with a two year balanced budget. (driven by the 2 year Boiler Code cycle)
BPV Code Recognized Revenue ($000)
Annual Print Sales (with deferrals) and Royalties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY05</th>
<th>FY06</th>
<th>FY07</th>
<th>FY08</th>
<th>FY09</th>
<th>FY10</th>
<th>FY11</th>
<th>FY12*</th>
<th>FY13</th>
<th>FY14</th>
<th>FY15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year Sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royalties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actuals for FY07-FY11; 6-month forecast for FY12; projections for FY13-FY15

Chart 1
32 Custodial Technical Division Financial Results
FY08 - FY12 (YTD Feb)
(§, 000s)

- Revenues
- Expenses
- Investment Results
- Net Operating

FY08: 1,700
FY09: 1,000
FY10: 1,500
FY11: 2,700
FY12 YTD Feb: 2,300

(200)
FY2013-15 Budget – Totals ($000)

DRAFT 3/30/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011 Actual</th>
<th>FY12 Dec</th>
<th>FY12 Fcst</th>
<th>2013 Bgt</th>
<th>2014 Bgt</th>
<th>2015 Bgt</th>
<th>3 Year Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>102.5</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>327.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>113.3</td>
<td>332.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total ASME Net</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>(3.6)</td>
<td>(2.5)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>(5.5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Institute Revenue 4.9 4.7 4.6 5.6 5.6 15.8
Institute Expense 3.3 4.5 4.6 5.1 4.6 14.3
Institute Net 1.6 0.2 - 0.5 1.0 1.5

**ASME Net figures include IGTI & IPTI Operations. They also include savings related to staffing opens and timing of hires.**
Next Steps

- Leaders and Staff work to achieve a three-year balanced operating budget for FY13-15 by April 20.
- Coordinate changes with COFI & SMC
- COFI reviews Budget at May 10-11 Meeting in NYC
- COFI to present three-year balanced budget to BOG in June
ASME Board of Governors
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Cover Memo

Date Submitted: March 26, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2102

To: Board of Governors
From: ASME.ORG Task Force
Presented by: Said Jahanmir and Susan O’Neil
Agenda Title: Task Force Progress Report

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

The Task Force has met on a monthly basis via teleconferences. We have reviewed the progress of the contractor, HUGE, and have provided monthly reports to the Presidential Team. The Task Force has also discussed the types of asme.org metrics that would be meaningful to the Society. A progress report is presented to the BOG for discussion. The Task Force expects to complete its assigned duties including recommended metrics by the June BOG meeting.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: None

Attachments: PowerPoint and Report
Advisory Task Force Update

Said Jahanmir, Chair
Howard Berkof
Warren DeVries
Julie Bachmann Kulik
Debra Newton
Reginald Vachon, Advisor to Task Force
Sharon Miller, ASME Staff
Susan O'Neill, External Consultant

BOG Meeting
April 19, 2012

FY12 Focus of Advisory Task Force

- Development of a Framework for evaluating how the web strategy is helping ASME achieve its business goals and vision for the future.
- Complex challenge because it requires an integrated perspective.
- Task Force believes this Framework will be helpful for future planning.
Background – Types of Web Site Measures

Traffic
- Page Views
- Visits
- Unique Visitors
- Returning Visitors

Visit Characteristics
- Referrers – search engines, external sites, internal
- Entry pages
- Visit duration

Content
- Google rankings
- Click-thru’s
- Most popular pages

Conversions -- Examples
- % of users who register
- % of users who comment on articles
- Click-thru’s on sponsorship ads

Monthly Analytics Dashboard
# Strategic Metrics Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enterprise Scorecard</th>
<th>ASME.org Goals and Approach</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Workforce Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand membership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broaden and increase community engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Example -- Energy

Objective: ASME will serve as an essential energy technology resource and a leading advocate for technically sound energy policies.

**ASME.org Goals and Approach**

- Highlight ASME’s energy expertise and knowledge
- Prioritization of Energy Topic Page strategy

**Potential Key Performance Indicators (KPI’s):**

- Search engine rankings for energy-related keywords
- Popularity of energy topic and article pages on the site
- Registered users from energy companies (Phase 2)
- E-commerce sales for energy products and services (Phase 3)

KPI’s should be viewed within the context of the larger Energy strategy and related activities.
Key Considerations

- **Inter-dependencies.** ASME.org is not a stand-alone product— it is an enabler and an integral component of ASME’s activities.

- **Content.** High value content drives and builds usage.

- **Awareness.** Marketing of the content and features available on ASME.org needs to be an ongoing commitment.

- **Long-term perspective.** Success will take time.

Next Steps

- Task Force will continue its work to flesh out the Strategic Metrics Framework and will make its recommendations to the BOG at the June meeting.

- Feedback and input from BOG members is welcome.
This report has been developed in consultation with the ASME.org Advisory Task Force. The members of the Task Force are: Said Jahanmir (Chair), Howard Berkof, Warren Devries, Julie Bachmann Kulik, Sharon Miller, Debra Newton, Susan O’Neill, and Reggie Vachon.
Key Digital Trends and Implications for ASME

The digital revolution has created a new paradigm for how individuals communicate and share knowledge, connect to one another, consume information, and manage their lives, and the behavior of our community members is changing quickly. When ASME embarked on the process to re-engineer ASME.org, it was clear that it is ASME’s ambition to be an effective player in the digital world of the 21st century.

The proliferation of digital media has changed how people expect to consume knowledge and information. Digital channels drive higher and more frequent rates of consumption across a greater variety of media. Collaboration and interaction are also made easier by digital developments, and this in turn has changed how people expect to share and network with each other. One-way communications is no longer effective. In today’s world, participation trumps broadcasting, and building a digitally visible business requires both high quality content and social connections.

ASME’s mission is to be the essential resource for mechanical engineers and other technical professionals throughout the world for solutions that benefit humankind. A digital strategy that demonstrates ASME’s relevance and depth of technical knowledge as well as putting ASME at the center of important engineering conversations is critical to achieving this mission. Integration of digital innovation into ASME’s activities is an important priority, and having a redesigned website was only a first step toward achieving the goal of being an effective digital organization.

So what does being digital mean for ASME?

- **A user-oriented perspective** rather than one focused on ASME’s organization and capabilities. Members and volunteers new to ASME should not be hampered by ASME’s internal structure; instead they should see the breadth of offerings and the ease with which they can participate and benefit.

- **High quality and relevant content.** The Topic Page approach introduced with the first release of ASME.org is a core building block for ASME’s digital content strategy but a dedicated, enterprise-wide focus on developing web-friendly content across all of ASME’s activities will be critical to the long-term success of the digital strategy.

- **Greater integration between off-line and on-line activities** to reach a broader audience and engage with them more frequently and with greater regularity.

- **A robust virtual community** that builds on ASME’s existing community activities and enables a higher volume of networking, collaboration and engagement. This is the focus of Phase 2 of the ASME.org project.

- **Online transactions that are easy and time-efficient** to complete. This will be the focus of Phase 3.
ASME’s Virtual Community Strategy

The new features that will be rolled out as part of Phase 2 will provide ASME with social networking capabilities to build and nurture a virtual community of Mechanical Engineers. Whether users participate in this virtual community as individuals or as part of an ASME group, they will be able to:

- Find each other and make new connections
- Network and share with each other
- Facilitate Group collaboration on engineering-related topics
- Comment on and debate current issues
- Communicate with each other more frequently
- Stay informed about what activities and events professionals in their fields are attending
- Participate in ASME online events
- Learn from each other

While there are broad social networking sites like Facebook and LinkedIn that are popular with millions of users across a wide range of interests and needs, there is a growing need for organizations like ASME to build and nurture “niche” communities that focus on specific groups of professionals and/or content areas. Networking and knowledge-sharing related to mechanical engineering belong in ASME’s realm, and it is only within that realm that the full community potential can be realized. Just as mechanical engineers value attending conferences and events with their peers, they will see value in participating in a virtual community composed of professionals just like them, with knowledge and interest areas similar to their own, especially one that is associated with an organization as reputable as ASME. In addition, the ASME.org community will provide a multi-dimensional experience, with a broad array of content and activities for participants while a site like LinkedIn offers only a single dimension.

Phase 2 features will support ASME in providing engineers of the 21st century with:

- The ability to participate on their own terms
  - Whenever they want – on demand
  - As much or as little participation as they have time
  - Convenient and easy (don’t have to travel or miss work)
- Value
  - High-quality content -- existing and emerging topic areas
  - Connections

ASME is evolving from a structured, “one size fits all” approach to a more organic and flexible approach that focuses on the needs of the engineers in the community and creates an environment in which more diverse types of collaboration and knowledge-sharing can occur. Phase 2 provides the infrastructure to support this evolution.
The potential benefits for ASME are significant and support ASME’s business strategy and vision for the future. In fact it is hard to imagine that ASME could continue to fulfill its mission without a robust online community as part of its portfolio of activities. This approach puts ASME at the center of mechanical engineering discussions, and thereby places ASME in a strong position to attract and engage a larger and broader range of mechanical engineers – more diverse, more geographically spread, younger and more likely to have expertise in new and emerging technical areas. It helps break down ASME’s silos and makes it easier for cross-sector collaboration and knowledge-sharing. In addition, it positions ASME to generate more revenue via e-commerce traffic, sponsorships and IP creation. Part of the strategy will be to put in place processes to measure and monitor our progress and assess our success in reaping these benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASME Activities</th>
<th>Traditional Environment</th>
<th>ASME’s Business Strategy &amp; Vision for the Future</th>
<th>How ASME.org Phase 2 Supports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>• Focus on joining</td>
<td>• Focus on engaging</td>
<td>• Allows ASME to offer more membership/engagement options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• One size fits all</td>
<td>• Flexibility and greater choice</td>
<td>• Eliminates geographical boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• US centric</td>
<td>• Global reach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts and Sections</td>
<td>• Based on proximity</td>
<td>• More active and expanded participation across the globe</td>
<td>• No longer limited by geography so ASME’s reach is expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centered around in-person meetings and events</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Will make it possible for individuals to participate whenever they have time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisions and Institutes</td>
<td>• Centered around conferences which are done annually or every two years</td>
<td>• More effective and frequent knowledge-sharing</td>
<td>• On-demand access to content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Stand alone publications</td>
<td>• Inter-sector collaboration and cross-pollination</td>
<td>• Ability to collaborate and share virtually – potential for faster and broader R&amp;D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Environment that encourage high quality IP development</td>
<td>• Greater ability for participation that is not limited by ASME’s internal structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater depth in priority technical areas</td>
<td>• Broader global reach will bring more experts into the mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to quickly respond to emerging technical areas</td>
<td>• Ad hoc groups can be created to support new emerging areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Resources</td>
<td>• Primarily tied to conferences and events</td>
<td>• Broad mix of educational and technical training offerings for diverse audiences</td>
<td>• Facilitates on demand training and education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 2 Roadmap and Plan

The remaining Phases 2 and 3 of the ASME.org redesign will be completed through a series of releases in the second half of calendar 2012 and into calendar 2013. This approach has been selected as a means to provide the organization with the time needed to execute migration and implementation support activities with care and to ensure that any necessary changes to internal ASME processes are managed effectively.

Phase 2 of the ASME.org project focuses primarily on features to drive ASME’s Community strategy. In addition, Phase 2 will include a navigational refresh and an update to the content in the About ASME sections of the site, as well as new capabilities that will support an online sponsorship strategy.

The Phase 2 Community features are depicted in the schematic on page 5 and include:

- **Participant Registration and Conversion** – the first step toward participation in the ASME.org online community
  - Ability for new users to register and become an ASME.org Participant
  - Ability for users with existing accounts (either as members or purchasers) to opt to convert these to become ASME.org Participants
- **Directory of Participants** – public directory of ASME.org community participants
- **Participant Profile** – when a user registers he or she can set up a personal profile highlighting their interests, experience, education and preferences. The profile will allow the user to determine what information to share with others in the community.
- **Participant Dashboard** – a user’s “personal” home page where he/she can see their community activity and receive customized alerts as well as review membership benefits and purchase history.
- **Groups** -- group collaboration and administration capabilities for existing groups within ASME as well as the ability for participants to create their own ad hoc groups as needed. Migration of existing group tools will be part of the effort.
- **Commenting** – ability for registered participants to comment publicly on Topic articles on ASME.org
- **Q&A** -- ability for registered participants to discuss and debate important questions affecting mechanical engineering.

Phase 2 will be rolled out in several releases during the second half of calendar 2012. The first release will focus on such key building block as registration and profiles since these must be in place before other Community features like Groups can be implemented.

The first Phase 2 release (Release 2.0) will bring significant change to the existing ASME.org web site; additionally, there are many members and volunteers who are active users of ASME’s existing online capabilities. Therefore, a “private preview” period will occur before the public launch of Release 2.0. This private preview, which is expected to last 4 to 6 weeks, will provide key stakeholders and invited guests with the ability to explore the new features and become familiar with them.
The implementation of the new Community features has been designed to make becoming an ASME.org Participant easy and attractive for existing ASME members. However, if a member does not choose to participate, they do not need to do anything and will continue to have access to their membership and purchase accounts.

- Members will be encouraged to become ASME.org Participants but it will be their decision.
- When a member registers, they will be able to import information from ASME as well as LinkedIn accounts. Members will be able to add new information and update existing information as needed.
- A member who registers will be able to set up their User Profile/Dashboard preferences and privacy settings.
- When a member registers, the new Participant Dashboard will be a one-stop shop for all online ASME activities including membership-related information as well as purchases.

A multi-faceted marketing and communications campaign will support the Phase 2 roll-out, with communications targeted for governance stakeholders, volunteers and members, and staff as well as the broader mechanical engineering professional community.

**Phase 2 Community Features**

![Diagram of Phase 2 Community Features]

- Participant Registration
- Participant Dashboard
- Participant Profile
- Group Pages & Profiles
- Directory of Participants
- Directory of Groups
- Commenting on Articles
- Q&A
- Member Only Activities
- Network Links
- Newsletter Mgmt.
- Group Participation
- Group Management
- Purchases
Looking Beyond Phase 2
While Phase 2 focuses on driving online Community activity, Phase 3 will include features and capabilities that will streamline and improve transaction activity as well as strengthen ASME’s ability to support career development and marketplace interaction. The goal will be to improve capabilities that are currently available as well as add new features. Phase 3 will be completed through a series of releases in calendar 2013 and will include:

- Calendar – a consolidated information source for all ASME conferences and events
- Conferences – tools to make it easier to develop and manage conference sites as well as to support easy online conference registration
- Job Board – a place where participants can explore and respond to job openings and potentially internships
- “Marketplace” – a Craigslist-style forum for products and services
- E-Commerce – improvements to the existing e-commerce engine

Also, it is critical to keep in mind that keeping its digital presence relevant, dynamic and up-to-date needs to be a constant and ongoing focus for ASME, in particular the regular development of web-friendly content on topics of strategic priority for ASME.
Date Submitted: March 1, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: Marketing & Sales/Membership Development
Presented by: Roy Arbeit
Agenda Title: Update on Engagement Models

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)
We will provide an update on our ongoing work effort to develop and test new engagement models.

Please Note: The attached deck contains a large amount of information and given the limited time for discussion, we will not be able to review every slide in detail. It’s therefore recommended that members of the Board review the slides in advance.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Attachments:
Engagement Model Update

Roy Arbeit
April 2012

Today’s Discussion

• Overall Objective of the Engagement Model Project
• Highlights from the Qualitative Research
• Quantitative Research – Top Line Results
  – Methodology and Design
  – Key Findings
• Recent Thinking on Engagement Model
• Next Steps
• Questions
Project Objective

• In April 2011, we discussed with the BOG the need to broaden ASME’s connections with the global engineering community by growing the number of individuals who engage with ASME.

• Engagement – We hypothesized that in today’s global and progressively digital world, engineers have a variety of needs and seek differing sets of value from their relationship with ASME and that our current one-size fits all value proposition is limited and prevents us from growing. Thus...

Project Objective

• Our strategy is to offer multiple and different ways to engage providing choices and allowing the person to choose the level or depth at which they would like to interact with ASME based on their individual needs.
Research Methodology - Qualitative

- **Qualitative** research is designed to allow in-depth exploration of various topics, so that the respondents can share concerns in their own words and can offer some of the reasons why they hold the opinions that they do.

- Qualitative research results are not statistically significant but are useful in testing hypotheses and providing directional guidance.

- We conducted focus groups both in the US as well as in the UK, China, Brazil, and India, and several online bulletin boards in the US.

Key Qualitative Research Findings

- The traditional motivations for joining an organization are changing

- Joining/serving in an organization is not as attractive on its own as it once may have been

- Of greatest interest to almost every participant is information sharing and content.

- Participants indicated growing use of digital resources for acquisition of information

Therefore, ASME needs to come up with new and different ways to serve up content and facilitate information sharing that are more in tune with the digital landscape.
### Research Methodology - Quantitative

- **Quantitative** research is often designed to put percentages next to the hypotheses generated by qualitative research by reaching out to larger numbers of the target population through the use of surveys. These results are usually statistically significant.

- The goals in this phase of the research included:
  - Test and validate key findings from the focus groups and bulletin boards regarding market/target audience needs.
  - Identify findings which can be viewed through the measure of statistical significance.
  - Evaluate the attractiveness of a range of tools and services that might be offered by ASME as a direct response to the needs expressed in the qualitative focus groups and bulletin boards.
Research Methodology – Conjoint Study

- As part of the quantitative research, the respondents were asked to complete an exercise called a “conjoint study”

- A conjoint study, based on statistical techniques, helps determine what combinations of a limited number of features/attributes are most influential in respondent choice ... and therefore guides our decision-making on marketability and pricing.

- Top line results from quantitative research completed. Conjoint results and model recommendation in June.

Quantitative Study Design

- A total of 1,513 interviews were conducted among mechanical engineers and others who provide mechanical engineering services.

- In total, 1,438 interviews were conducted online. The interviews in Brazil (75) were conducted by telephone.

- The online interviews were conducted using lists of mechanical engineers for each country. The lists were acquired by ASME from a variety of sources.

- In addition, a group of US Members (342) was included in the research to measure differences in responses and identify potential cannibalization.
Distribution of the Interviews

Leading Job Functions Among the Respondents

- Design/Development engineering: 31%
- Engineering management: 18%
- Consulting/Professional services: 13%
- Project management: 11%
- Research and development engineering: 9%
- Education/Teaching/Academic faculty: 5%
- Testing or quality assurance: 5%
- Corporate management: 4%
Leading Industries Among the Respondents

- Manufacturing 26%
- Energy/Power/Nuclear 11%
- Consulting/Design/Professional services 10%
- Mining/Oil and gas extraction 8%
- Defense/Aerospace 6%
- University/College/Education 6%
- Construction 5%
- Professional, scientific, and technical services 4%

Age of the Respondents

The median age of the respondents is 41.1
Years Worked in Mechanical Engineering

Four in ten respondents have worked in mechanical engineering for 10 years or fewer; 34% have worked as MEs for more than 20 years.

Membership in Professional Societies: By Country

Canada has the highest membership in professional societies (among the respondents in total); China has the lowest.
Key Finding #1

Engineers around the world are moving to embrace the digital landscape

Membership in Professional Societies: By Age

Mechanical engineers who are under 35 are much less likely to be members of traditional professional societies, looking instead to gather and share information through digital channels.
Association Activities in the Last Six Months*

- Read a magazine or other publication from one of your associations 92%
- Visited one of your associations’ Web sites for information related to meetings or activities 71%
- Visited one of your associations’ Web sites for either technical information or other information related to your field 70%
- Attended a meeting, conference, or social event for association members 39%

* Among members of professional societies or associations

Web Site Profiles: By Years of Experience

About one-half of engineers surveyed have profiles on LinkedIn

![Web Site Profiles Chart](chart.png)
Web Content Contribution: By Age

Approximately a quarter of engineers surveyed contribute content to LinkedIn related to engineering while younger engineers are even more inclined to do so on Facebook.

Ease of Interacting on the Web: By Age

A significant majority of engineers agree that they would interact more often with others in their profession if it were easier to do.
Key Finding #2

Engineers are hungry for information and often don’t have the time or interest to “connect” in the traditional association model.

Digital Features Rated as More Likely to Use

**Archive of Content and Articles** – Access to an online archive of articles, news stories, case studies, profiles, videos, and other content from the Web site of an international engineering association.

**Electronic Interactive Library** – Search and browse within a 100-volume online technical library, with books and texts across all disciplines of mechanical engineering. Tables, calculators, charting, and graphing tools are embedded, making it highly interactive.

**“A Spotlight On...”** – Webinars on engineering and technical subjects, including question-and-answer sessions with presenters and panelists.
Traditional Connection Features Rated as Less Likely to Use

**Insurance Products and Financial Services** – Competitively priced life, medical, dental, and other insurance products, as well as investment advisory services provided by leading companies.

**Geographic Chapters and Technical Divisions** – Two options to connect with the mechanical engineering community: 1) Participate in meetings and attend events in your geographic area, providing the opportunity to connect locally with engineers and other technical professionals within your industry; 2) Take part in technical conferences and events geared specifically toward your areas of expertise, interests, or industry.

---

**Key Finding #3**

English is not an immediate barrier to entry overseas, (in China, Brazil and other parts of Latin America); but longer term success rests on our ability to customize content in native languages.
Comfort with English
In Non-English-Speaking Countries

In general, about one third of respondents from the non-English speaking countries indicated that they were very comfortable reading technical articles and other information in English. However, roughly half of the respondents indicated that they were only somewhat comfortable in doing so.

Summary -- Key Research Insights

- Market research validates the inadequacy of the current “one size fits all” membership model focused on in-person engagement through Sections & Divisions.
- Engineers are moving to embrace digital channels for information gathering / sharing, particularly younger MEs.
- Content/information delivered digitally ranked higher than other types of services which could be provided by organizations such as ASME.
- English language content would be accepted in key international markets but native language content would have higher acceptance/usage.
Recent Thinking on Engagement Models

Engagement Model Update - April 2012
Engagement Model is Linked to ASME.org

**Membership** traditionally based on “joining” with one size fits all and US centric → **ASME.org** allows ASME to offer more membership/engagement options and eliminates geographic boundaries.

**Districts & Sections** traditionally based on proximity and centered around in-person meetings/events → **ASME.org** will allow for participation based on the individual’s schedule and no longer limited by geography.

**Divisions and Institutes** traditionally centered around annual or bi-annual conferences and stand alone publications → **ASME.org** will support online collaboration with the potential for faster R&D and broader global reach without travel constraints.

**Educational Resources** traditionally tied to conferences and events → **ASME.org** will facilitate on demand training/education.

---

Transforming Engagement that will result in...

- **Begin Engagement at any point**
- **Digital, Face to Face or Combination**
- **Consume and/or Contribute**

- **Participate in society activities**
  - Serve on technical division or code committees, student chapters and sections, review papers

- **First Contact**
  - Search on Google, social media, link sharing, school or other in-person contacts

- **Learn & Explore**
  - Read content, watching webcasts, subscribe to podcasts

- **Govern & Lead**
  - Chair a committee, hold elected office, etc.

- **Communicate with other engineers**
  - Comment, complete profile, offer to answer questions or mentor, participate in Q&A, offer professional development advice, share content

- **Rely on ASME Resources**
  - Purchase products, sign up for newsletter, use E-library, enroll in course/training, attend conference, attend meeting, search jobs, search marketplace

...an integrated network and transformed community
Next Steps

- Complete analysis of quantitative and conjoint studies

- Present recommendations to the Board in June for new engagement models(s)

- Based on BOG feedback, a go-to-market strategy plan will be developed including:
  
  - Identifying systems and/or new product development requirements
  
  - Marketing communications plan and timing for launch

- In-market staged test phase focused on a defined set of target engineers/specific market areas

- Input from volunteers via the Board Liaison will continue to be solicited
Questions?
Date Submitted: March 30, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: Publishing Department
Presented by: Philip DiVietro
Agenda Title: ASME Digital Library, update on new platform

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)
The ASME Digital Library, www.asmedl.org, which hosts journals, conference proceedings and e-books, is moving to a new online platform. Scheduled launch date is November 1, 2013. Silverchair Information Systems is the new service provider.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: None.

Attachments: Publishing new Digital Library Platform BOG April 19.ppt
ASME Digital Library Update

Publishing
Philip DiVietro, Managing Director,

BOG Meeting
April 19, 2012

ASME Digital Library
www.asmedl.org

- Leaving the current platform hosted by the American Institute of Physics (AIP).
- Moving to New Digital Library state of the art platform.
- Silverchair Information Systems is the new technology company.
- Development and implementation of comprehensive taxonomy for mechanical engineering discipline.
- Robust semantic driven implementation.
- Member single sign on.
- Seamless presentation with the new ASME.org.
- Interface will mirror look and feel of ASME.org
- Mobile Apps
ASME Board of Governors
Agenda Item
Cover Memo

Date Submitted: April 3rd
BOG Meeting Date: April 19th

To: Board of Governors
From: COFI / ASME Finance
Presented by: Tom Pestorius / Reginald Vachon
Agenda Title: HQ Task Force Update

Agenda Item Executive Summary:

COFI requested and received an update on the financial implications of the move to 2 Park Avenue, including the alternatives available to ASME for the funding of the upcoming leasehold improvements.

Tom Pestorius and Reginald Vachon will provide an update to the Board of Governors on the financial implications of the move to 2 Park Avenue.

Proposed motion for BOG Action:

none

Attachments:

Leasehold Improvement Financing 4 3 12.ppt and Project Plan
COFI
Financing the Move to 2 Park Avenue

ASME Leasehold Payments

• Could incur $19.6 M over next ten months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>VVA Estimate</th>
<th>VVA Contingency</th>
<th>ASME Contingency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$19.6 M</td>
<td>$16.9M</td>
<td>$1.7 M</td>
<td>$1.0 M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ASME net obligation projected $12.7M
- $1.7 M contingency to prevent overspend
- COFI recommends $1.0 M ASME contingency
COFI - Financing Move to Two Park Avenue

COFI explored borrowing & does not recommend borrowing:

- No mortgage alternative (leasehold improvements cannot be securitized)
- No fixed rate alternative (without derivatives)
- Floating interest rates = risk higher future costs
- Collateral required for unsecured loans
  - ASME place invested assets on deposit
  - All loan alternatives require 140% collateralization - Utilizes Excess Reserves
- Significant additional collateral to fix rate
- Legal and Financing Costs

ASME reserves of $70.6 M (29 Feb 12)

- Requirements: 60% of average of three prior year operating expenses
  - 2009 Expenses: $79.3 million
  - 2010 Expenses $84.8 million
  - 2011 Expenses $92.7 million
- Reserve requirement is $51.4 M Thus, Excess Reserves: $19.2 M

Reserves adequate for ASME Leasehold Improvements; Payments capitalized & will impact reserves amortized over 15 years
COFI - Financing Move to Two Park Avenue

Conclusions and Next Steps:

Updated cash and liquidity forecast in May

COFI recommends financing move to Two Park by utilizing:

• Existing cash on hand
• Landlord reimbursements
• Operating cash flow
• Cash from liquidating investments

COFI - Financing Move to Two Park Avenue

Conclusions and Next Steps:

COFI will make a final recommendation on funding when updated forecast is available

William Lowery, ASME investment advisor, has been consulted and will be asked for recommendations on liquidating investments to finance the move
Date Submitted: March 29, 2012  
BOG Meeting Date: April 19 & 20, 2012

To: Board of Governors  
From: Committee of Past Presidents  
Presented by: Sam Zamrik  
Agenda Title: CPP Task Force and Committee Participation

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

To provide the BOG with an update on CPP Committee participation and future initiatives

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Attachments:
## Committee of Past Presidents 2011-2012

### Task Forces and Committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Board, Strategic Issues, EDESC, Fellows Review Cmte., Public Affairs and Outreach Council, Pension Plan Trustees</td>
<td>ASME Leadership TF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Industry Advisory Board, the Gantt Medal and Dixy Lee Ray Medal Award Committees.</td>
<td>Ernest Daman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Comm, ECLIPSE, LA Section ASME</td>
<td>Joseph Falcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives</td>
<td>Gene Feigel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzroy Award Committee</td>
<td>Nancy Fitzroy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO Section ASME</td>
<td>Leroy (Skip) Fletcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COFI</td>
<td>Robert Gaither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics, Nominating Committee, AAES Issue Group on Licensure</td>
<td>Amos Holt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board on New Development, Pension Plan Trustees, Special Working Group on Nuclear Plant Aging Management (SC XI), Task Group on Impulsively Loaded Vessels (SC VIII), Subgroup NUPACK (SC III)</td>
<td>Nate Hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Issues Opportunities and Knowledge</td>
<td>Robert Nickell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Board</td>
<td>John Parker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Engine Tech Cmte, Fellows Review Cmte., Roe Medal, Co Chair Foundation</td>
<td>Win Phillips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLIPSE, Energy Committee</td>
<td>Richard Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECLIPSE, History/Heritage, District A Operations Board</td>
<td>Richard Rosenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair COFI, Chair Audit Committee, Member Strategic Issues Opportunities and Knowledge, Member Fellows Review Cmte., Chair and member EXCOM American Association of Engineering Societies, VP North America- Pan American Association of Engineering Societies, Asst Treasurer Pan American Academy of Engineering., Member UN Committee of World Federation of Engineering Organizations.</td>
<td>Reggie Vachon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLT</td>
<td>Bill Weiblen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics, Nominating Committee</td>
<td>Sam Zamrik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don Zwiep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
AGENDA ITEM EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: (Do not exceed the space provided)

An ASME Board Performance Assessment Survey was completed by 39 people representing current and recent Board members and SVPs, as well as Key Staff and Volunteers. 20 of the 26 questions were essentially the same as those in the 2008 Board Evaluation so the extent to which changes have occurred could be assessed. Additional open-ended questions were also added to encourage candid input and feedback.

This presentation provides an overview of the key themes stemming from the survey results, as well as recommendations for future action & discussion to address opportunities identified that can improve and enhance Board interactions and operations.

PROPOSED MOTION FOR BOG ACTION: (if appropriate)

For Information only and to stimulate discussion of potential future actions.

ATTACHMENTS:

PowerPoint Slide Deck
Summary of Survey Questions and Response Data
2012 Board Performance Assessment

Results and Recommendations

Betty L. Bowersox
For the Committee on Governance

19-April-2012

Background:

An ASME Board Performance Assessment was conducted in Feb-March 2012. The overriding purpose was to help show where the Board’s strengths lie, and identify opportunities to improve future operations.

- 43 Assessments were distributed using the Zoomerang Survey Tool; 39 responses were received.
  - 12 Governors* (100% response rate)
  - 8 SVPs [4 current + 4 past] (100%)
  - 10 ELT ** and other Key Staff (83%)
  - 9 Key Volunteers and Committee Chairs (82%)

* Included President, Past President and President-elect.
** included the Executive Director.
Background (continued):

- The Assessment included 20 questions from the 2008 Board Evaluation Survey
  - To allow measurement of perceived Board operation changes over the past 2 ½ years.
  - Note that the respondents and the groupings were slightly different between the two surveys.

- Seven (7) open-ended questions included for candid input and feedback.
  - 4 of these were also used in the 2008 Evaluation

- All results, with some filtered analysis, provided in a separate attachment.

Basic Statistics: Looking at “All Respondents” Avg

- 2012 Results Grouped by
  Good/4-5(Green), Okay/3-4(Yellow), Opportunity/1-3(Red)

- Green: 4 Q’s 1, 3, plus
  7 & 20 (Yellow if Key Volunteers ignored)

- Yellow: 20 Q’s 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 26, and 21 (Red if Key Volunteers ignored)

- Red: 2 Q’s 8, 24 (close to yellow)
Basic Statistics: Comparing 2012 against 2008
Looking at “BOG+SVP+KeyStaff” Averages only

- Higher Average Scores: qty 6
  - Questions 4, 12, 14, 15, 16, 18 (red in 2008)
- Lower Average Scores: qty 9
  - Questions 1, 3, 6, 9, 11, 17, plus 2, 7 & 20 (green in 2008)
- Negligible change: qty 5
  - Questions 5, 8, 10, 13, 19

Areas where we’re successful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. We have a constructive relationship with ASME Staff.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. We respectfully work together.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Board members act cohesively to support Board decisions once they are made.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. We are optimistic about our ability to deal with whatever the future brings in the next 3 years.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Y - Question would be ‘yellow’ if Key Volunteer input not included

Staff also thought the Board was doing well on:
14. Our strategic plan guides our goals and actions [4.20].
16. We regularly monitor and evaluate our progress toward strategic goals [4.30].
20. We are optimistic about our ability to deal with whatever the future brings in the next 3 years [4.10].

While the Board thought they were also good on:
7. Board members act cohesively to support Board decisions once they are made [4.25].

➤ The only “Green” by the SVPs was Question #1:
Areas of Greater Opportunity:

- Q#8 was also highlighted as a ‘needs improvement’ in 2008; Average trended slightly positive (up) in 2012
- Q’s 21 and 24 were new in the 2012 assessment

*R - Question would be ‘red’ if Key Volunteer input not included

- Key Staff (Avg as a Group) rated Q#21 as an area the Board could improve on (red),
- The BOG Avg for Q#24 put it into the yellow.
  - Q#8 was also highlighted as a ‘needs improvement’ in 2008; Average trended slightly positive (up) in 2012
  - Q’s 21 and 24 were new in the 2012 assessment

The SVPs scored a total of 11 questions with an average under 3.0

Areas of Opportunity (per SVPs):

- Effective use of time, being proactive vs reactive, time taken to make decisions
- Communication – relating to constituencies, communicating openly & effectively
- Board Committees effectively used, decisions focused on polices vs tactics

Could averages be low due to the Sector Re-alignment efforts??
Basic Statistics: How entity Groupings compared
[Good/4-5 vs Okay/3-4 vs Opportunities/1-3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>AGREED</th>
<th>RATED HIGHER</th>
<th>RATED LOWER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOG vs SVP</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG vs Key Staff</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVP vs Key Staff</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOG vs Key Vol</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVP vs Key Vol</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>58.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Staff vs Key Vol</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Categories for Improvement Opportunities

A. Examine/Evaluate Board Make-up
   Review Board composition – are members recognized and accountable for different areas of expertise/skill (clarify if technical- or ASME-related experts, or both?); Consider methods to establish guidelines for NC selection of Board members representative of stakeholders, reflective of diversity, etc.

B. Improved Communication
   As related to ASME’s diverse constituencies; openness within the Board and the broader ASME community; dissemination and execution of the BOG’s actions, plans & decisions.

C. Increased or Directed Training
   Orientation, continuous job/role training, ever expanding knowledge/understanding of ASME as a whole.
Key Categories for Improvement Opportunities

D. Elucidation of Expectations & Execution needs: Increased Transparency

The perceptible assessment evaluation gaps need to be reduced. SVP average ratings on questions were lower than both BOG & Staff, as individual groups, approximately 50% of the time: compare with SVP average responses in 2008 that were 65% higher than BOG and 30% higher than Staff.

E. Sweat the Big Stuff

Deal better with the big/substantive organizational issues, facilitate progress by more effective use of time.

Where has progress been made?

A. Preparedness for Meetings

Access to information in a timely way to make decisions has improved, as well as effective use of time (Instituted Agenda Item Cover memos and early receipt of agendas)

B. Strategic Consistency and Metrics

The results showed improved attention and access to metrics with which to evaluate both progress and organizational performance and our Consistency of goals and actions with the strategic intents was rated well overall.
What’s Next - recommendations?

1. Continue the dialog regarding assessment results amongst the respondents. Evaluate if any average scores or interpretations might be biased due to ongoing projects.

2. Determine a few short and long term actions that will address the Key Opportunities highlighted, and develop action plans for improvement - 3Ws.

3. Repeat the Board Assessment survey for continued evaluation of Board Operations annually, or at a minimum after Sector re-alignments have been completed. [Assign to COG]

Supplemental Graphs and Summaries
Board Assessment Results (Comparison)

2012 ASME Board Evaluation Results - (1-5 Scale)

Board Assessment Results (Board)

Board members gave themselves an average score of 3.65 (it was 3.4 in 2008)

2012 ASME Board Evaluation Results - Board (1-5 Scale)
Board Assessment Results (Staff)

Staff members gave the Board an average score of 3.57 (it was 3.6 in 2008)

Board Assessment Results (SVPs)

The SVPs gave the Board an average score of 3.02 (compared with 3.65 by Board and 3.57 by Staff)
Open-Ended Question Input:

**What area(s) of Board performance require improvement?**

* Better training/understanding about the organization and needs of the Sectors
* Board Membership - need non-traditional candidates, those with right talents, more diversity
  **>>** Size - makes diversity difficult (age, Int'l, corporate leadership, background, gender)
* Continued focus on the Strategic - focus, planning (long-range), setting vision,
* Communication - with Volunteer leadership, between Board and Staff/volunteers.
* Being prepared for meetings
* Understanding the Global challenges/cultural diversity

**What are the Board’s greatest strengths?**

* The passion/dedication/engagement/support of members to make ASME better
* Openness in discussions, Good relationship between members, Collegiality
* Diversity of Thought
* Good interaction/relationship with ED and staff
* Willingness to put in the effort, take on the issues, get things done, take risks
* Understanding the organization, wide spectrum of expertise

Open-Ended Question Input:

Describe the Board’s level of engagement with the rest of the organization.

* Removed/disconnected/superficial/unaware/disengaged/inadequate/isolated/needs improvement
* Adequate, moderate, balanced, good
* Some more than others, minimal/isolated (except with familiar constituency),
* It doesn't matter as long as there are results
* Connected at the top / ELT
* Need more to front lines/sector level (communication)

Synopsis of Staff-BOG Communication-related Results:

- **Constructive Relationship; we respectfully work together.**
- **We’re sometimes uncomfortable when we disagree with each other.**
- **We need to relate better to our diverse constituencies within ASME.**
- **There is the opportunity for open communication, meaningful discussion and timely resolution of issues at Board mtgs.**
- **We need to better communicate the Board's actions, plans and decisions to ASME Leadership and broader community.**
2012 Board Performance Assessment Results and Recommendations Report
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Summary of Survey Questions and Responses

Betty L. Bowersox
For the Committee on Governance

19-April-2012
ASME Board Performance Assessment, 2012

Please use the 1 to 5 scale noted below to answer the question: Are you satisfied with ASME Board performance in the following areas:

1. We have a constructive relationship with ASME Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How to interpret the matrix:
1. Gov 2012 > Gov 2008 Fill with Light Green, Trend Up
4. All Respondents Avg > 4.00 Fill box by question with Dark Green (4-5)
5. 2012 Staff Avg > 4.00 Fill 2012 Gen'l Health trend column color Dark Green (4-5)
## Zoomerang Survey Results

### ASME Board Performance Assessment, 2012

Please use the 1 to 5 scale noted below to answer the question: Are you satisfied with ASME Board performance in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color Codes:</th>
<th>2012 vs 2008 Comparison</th>
<th>2012 General Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher than 2008</td>
<td>2012 Avg 4-5</td>
<td>2012 Avg 4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same as 2008</td>
<td>2012 Avg 3-4</td>
<td>2012 Avg 3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower than 2008</td>
<td>2012 Avg 1-3</td>
<td>2012 Avg 1-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. We have a constructive relationship with ASME Staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>Gov/SVP/Staff 2012 Avg</th>
<th>Gov/SVP/Staff 2008 Avg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>(4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>(4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>(4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>(4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov + 2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. We have a constructive relationship with ASME Volunteer Leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>% 0 5 8 20 4</th>
<th>% 0 14 22 54 11</th>
<th>% 0 34 4 1</th>
<th>% 0 1 2 1 0</th>
<th>% 0 12 8 27 2</th>
<th>% 0 5 21 69 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=37)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. We respectfully work together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>% 0 5 8 20 4</th>
<th>% 0 16 45 39</th>
<th>% 0 3 4 5</th>
<th>% 0 2 3 2 0</th>
<th>% 0 1 4 3 1</th>
<th>% 0 1 2 1 0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=38)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. We get the right amount of information in a timely manner to make decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>% 0 5 8 20 4</th>
<th>% 0 14 22 54 11</th>
<th>% 0 34 4 1</th>
<th>% 0 1 2 1 0</th>
<th>% 0 3 9 27 2</th>
<th>% 0 5 21 69 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
5. We effectively use our time to facilitate progress on important and substantive organizational issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=38)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.29 ↔</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.25 ↔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governors Only (Qty=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.33 ↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00 ↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012 SVP (Qty=4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25 ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All SVPs (Qty=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.75 ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 Governors (9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 Staff (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2008 SVPs (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. We are comfortable disagreeing with each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.60 ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governors Only (Qty=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.83 ↑</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.20 ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012 SVP (Qty=4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.25 ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All SVPs (Qty=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.88 ↓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3-4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Board members act cohesively to support Board decisions once they are made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov + 2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov + 2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 8. Each Board member has a recognized area of expertise for which s/he is held accountable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 9. Each Board member represents a broad range of members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### All Respondents (Qty=39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Governors Only (Qty=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012 SVP (Qty=4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### All SVPs (Qty=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 2008 Governors (9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 2008 Staff (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 2008 SVPs (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 10. As a Board, we are proactive rather than reactive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### All Respondents (Qty=39)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Governors Only (Qty=12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2012 SVP (Qty=4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### All SVPs (Qty=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 2008 Governors (9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 2008 Staff (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### All SVPs (Qty=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 2008 Governors (9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### 2008 Staff (8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### All SVPs (Qty=8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 10. As a Board, we are proactive rather than reactive.

- **Governors Only (Qty=12):** 3.67 (3-4)
- **ASME Staff Only (Qty=10):** 3.00 (3-4)
- **2012 SVP (Qty=4):** 2.75 (1-3)
- **All SVPs (Qty=8):** 2.75 (1-3)
- **Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9):** 3.33
- **Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1):** 3.15
- **2008 Governors (9):** 3.50
- **2008 Staff (8):** 3.38
- **2008 SVPs (3):** 3.00

### 10. As a Board, we are proactive rather than reactive.

- **Governors Only (Qty=12):** 3.25 (3-4)
- **ASME Staff Only (Qty=10):** 3.30 (3-4)
- **2012 SVP (Qty=4):** 2.25 (1-3)
- **All SVPs (Qty=8):** 3.00 (1-3)
- **Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9):** 3.56
- **Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1):** 3.62
- **2008 Governors (9):** 3.00 (1-3)

10. As a Board, we are proactive rather than reactive.
11. Board members understand the roles and responsibilities of a Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9) | 0% | 10%  | 0% | 30% | 5% |
Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov + 2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1) | 0% | 10% | 0% | 50% | 5% |
2008 Governors (9) | 0% | 10% | 0% | 70% | 5% |
2008 Staff (8) | 0% | 10% | 0% | 50% | 5% |
2008 SVPs (3) | 0% | 10% | 0% | 50% | 5% |

12. Board members understand ASME’s mission, purpose, and products, and are knowledgeable about its major programs and services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov + 2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. We take the right amount of time to make decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Our strategic plan guides our goals and actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Our decisions focus on policies, not tactics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. We regularly monitor and evaluate our progress toward strategic goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Governors (9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Staff (8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 SVPs (3)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. We use Board committees effectively to facilitate our work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=38)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. We regularly monitor and evaluate our progress toward strategic goals.

17. We use Board committees effectively to facilitate our work.
## Agenda Appendix 2.5.11

### 18. We use clear metrics to measure organizational and personal performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 19. We provide adequate orientation and training for Board members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 20. We are optimistic about our ability to deal with whatever the future brings in the next 3 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 21. All necessary skills, stakeholders and diversity are represented on the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=38)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov + 2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Board members receive adequate ongoing training, education about the society, and skills development throughout their term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty 10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8))</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. We spend adequate time engaging in strategic planning that helps us to consider how ASME should meet new trends and developments, opportunities and challenges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=38)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty 10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8))</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. The Board is effective in relating to its diverse constituencies within the broader community of ASME.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=39)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Board members receive adequate ongoing training, education about the society, and skills development throughout their term. (3-4)
### 25. Board meetings are conducted in a manner which ensures open communication, meaningful discussion and timely resolution of issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=38)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8))</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 26. Effective communication is maintained with ASME Volunteer leadership and the broader community of ASME regarding the actions, plans and decisions of the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>maybe or not sure</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents (Qty=38)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Only (Qty=12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Staff Only (Qty=10)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012 SVP (Qty=4)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All SVPs (Qty=8))</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov (Qty = 9)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Volunteers + 2011 Gov +2010/11 SVPs (Qty = 1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please provide your input on the following open-ended questions:

27. What was/were/will be the Board’s major accomplishment(s) for FY2012?
29 Responses, Most common are summarized

- Internal (Sector) reorganizations
- Strategic Initiatives - direction, Implementation, Planning,
- ASME.org - presence, support and rollout
- Move to 2 Park Ave
- E4C - New ventures, support, success
- Global Activities - expanding, accomplishments
- Fiscal responsibility
- Communication - starting to improve

28. What is/are the Board’s greatest strength(s)?
33 Responses, Most common are summarized

- The passion/dedication/engagement/support of members to make ASME better
- Openness in discussions, Good relationship between members, Collegiality
- Diversity of Thought
- Good interaction/relationship with ED and staff
- Willingness to put in the effort, take on the issues, get things done, take risks
- Understanding the organization, wide spectrum of expertise

29. What area(s) of Board performance require improvement?
31 Responses, Most common are summarized

- Better training/understanding about the organization and needs of the Sectors
- Board Membership - need non-traditional candidates, those with right talents, more diversity
- Board Size - makes diversity difficult (age, Int’l, corporate leadership, background, gender)
- Continued focus on the Strategic - focus, planning (long-range), setting vision.
- Communication - with Volunteer leadership, between Board and Staff/volunteers.
- Being prepared for meetings
- Understanding the Global challenges/cultural diversity
### 30. How would you describe the Board's level of engagement with the rest of the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>34 Responses, Most common are summarized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Removed/disconnected/superficial/unaware/disengaged/inadequate/isolated/needs improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate, moderate, balanced, good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some more than others, minimal/isolated (except with familiar constituency),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It doesn’t matter as long as there are results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected at the top / ELT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more to front lines/sector level (communication)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 31. How meaningful and fulfilling has been your experience serving on, or being involved with, the Board?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33 Responses, Most common are summarized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very meaningful/fulfilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally rewarding/intellectually simulating/satisfying/challenging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Great/wonderful/outstanding experience, group is engaged/dedicated/helps global engineering & society at large
Good/Positive/enjoyable
Learned/learning a lot
Could be improved/less than expected/not dynamic or agile enough

### 32. When becoming involved with the Board you had ideas on how you expected to help ASME, ideas that have or haven't come to fruition. Explicitly highlight no more than two that are still important to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28 Responses, Most common are summarized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve Communication (within ASME, and about engineering worldwide)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy of growth within ASME &amp; definition of 'membership'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodical indentification, development, and training of Leaders within the organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing engagement of ECEs within ASME and in leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing ASME's prestige, especially internationally - being a beacon of leadership and innovation/continued humanitarian collaboration/quicker implementation of int'l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board more strategic/forward looking/setting Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of innovation and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assuring the right information /guidance is avaialbe to make informed decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of innovation and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
33. How I can help the Board to improve:

27 Responses, Most common are summarized

- Share my experience/educate others/offer insights
- Stay engaged/involved
- Keep focus on the Strategic/long-range planning/be directive
- Provide timely/appropriate information
- Help expand ASME Internationally, improve ASME's worldwide customer service
- Communication up and down the organization

The following question must be completed for analysis purposes:

34. Please identify your current relationship with the Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governor/Board</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past-Governor/Board, term ended in 2011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past-Senior Vice President, term ended in 2010 or 2011</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASME Executive Leadership Team and other Key Staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Committee Chairs, Task Force Members, and other Key Volunteers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There will be a discussion on the procedures the Board will follow to have a common list of issues that should be communicated to the ASME membership. Some issues may not necessarily be covered during a Board meeting, but are important to convey to the membership. The Board should agree on a common message on items that are covered during the Board meeting itself. The need for time to be set aside at the conclusion of each Board meeting to review these items will be considered.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate) None
Date Submitted: 25 – March 2012  
BOG Meeting Date: 19, 20 – April 2012  

To: Board of Governors  
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) Committee on Governance  
Presented by: Rob Pangborn  
Agenda Title: Update of COG Activities  

Agenda Item Executive Summary:  (Do not exceed the space provided)  

As stipulated in the ASME By-Laws, this report will present an update of the ongoing activities of COG consistent with its charge, and specifically initiatives related to:  
— training and leadership development  
— evaluation of Board performance  
— communication of newsworthy and meeting topics of interest to the larger organization.  

Proposed motion for BOG Action:  (if appropriate)  

None  

Attachments:  

3 PowerPoint slides
Update of Activities of the Committee on Governance

Rob Pangborn, COG Chair

BOG Meeting
April 20, 2012

The Committee on Governance continues to meet monthly to address key aspects of its charge:

- Conversations with the leadership of VOLT, Nominating Committee and the Board Task Force on Leadership regarding training for NC members, candidates, nominees, governor and SVP elects, and sitting governors and SVPs, as well as leadership development and succession planning.
- Potential to engage Board “fellows” or advisers to bring particular perspectives, such as non-US, industry CEO, or economic expert viewpoint and experience, to the Board.
- Coordinating with the presidential team, executive director and conference planning groups to identify appropriate generative discussion topics and speakers in a way that addresses key issues, strategic interests and advance preparation for retreat and other board meetings.
COG Activities, continued

• Compilation of a running list of potential topics for future BOG webinars.

• Survey of Board Performance to provide a longitudinal perspective (compared to the 2008 survey) and viewpoints of key Board constituents [governors & past governors, SVPs and past SVPs, key staff and volunteers] – see additional agenda item.

• Identification of newsworthy issues or activities, quarterly, for inclusion in the Communications Toolkit, and selection of several items of business to be emphasized and communicated from each Board meeting.
ASME Board of Governors
Agenda Item
Cover Memo

Date Submitted: March 2, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) Marc Goldsmith/Phil Hamilton
Presented by: Marc Goldsmith, Jess Dods (consultant)
Agenda Title: Board Retreat Preparation

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

This session will include:
- A review of the objectives and draft agenda for the Board’s July 18-20 retreat in Cambridge, MA.
- Introduce conversation about growth objectives for ASME and integration with the Society’s strategic priorities.
- Introduce Myers-Briggs and DISC self-awareness tools.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)
None

Attachments: Two PowerPoint Presentations
Board of Governors’ Retreat
“Integrating Strategy and Building and Building a High Performance Team”
July 18-20, 2012
The Charles Hotel
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Objectives

• Engage in strategic and generative discussions about ASME’s strategic priorities, with an emphasis on integrating the three strategic priorities with a vision for global growth (e.g., $xxxM in revenues in 10 years, yyyK members in five years or ....).

• Gain a deeper understanding of the value of an integrated strategy and the challenges, opportunities and implications for successful execution of the integrated strategy, e.g. the need for high performing teams.
**BOG Retreat Preview**

*Objectives (cont.)*

- Gain knowledge about global trends and issues and how they may provide opportunities and threats for ASME.

- Develop greater understanding of ASME’s core competencies, growth opportunities and challenges and how they impact execution of the society’s strategic directions.

- Facilitate Board and leadership team building and collaboration.

*ASME will be the essential resource for mechanical engineers and other professionals throughout the world for solutions that benefit humankind.*

**BOG Retreat Preview**

*Pre-Retreat: April BOG*

- Introduce the conversation on growth objectives and integration with ASME’s strategic priorities

- Overview of Myers-Briggs and DISC self-awareness and team building tools
  - Relevance to COG Board assessment survey
BOG Retreat Preview

Pre-Retreat: May

- Conduct Myers-Briggs online survey
- Hold webinar to discuss aggregated Myers-Briggs survey results (May 21 at 11:00 Eastern time)

Pre-Retreat: June BOG

- Briefing on new environmental scan on emerging trends and issues expected to impact engineering and/or ASME.
- Review of final retreat agenda
BOG Retreat Preview

Pre-Retreat: June – early July

- Conduct DISC online survey
- Hold webinar to discuss aggregated DISC survey results (July 9 at 11:00 Eastern time)

BOG Retreat Agenda

Wednesday, July 18
- Welcome reception and dinner

Thursday, July 19 (Morning)
- Group Culture Report and Discussion
  - Jess Dods
- Integrating ASME’s Strategic Priorities and Growth Objectives
  - Tom Loughlin: leveraging the mission/market mix
  - June Ling: standards, certification, accreditation & training
  - Roy Arbeit: member engagement and market intelligence
  - Mike Ireland: technical programs
BOG Retreat Agenda

Thursday, July 19 (Afternoon)

• Lunch: MIT’s OpenCourseWare

• Improving Strategy Integration and Execution: Lessons Learned
  – Panel of speakers TBD

• Review of Day 1 and Framing Day 2

---

BOG Retreat Agenda

Friday, July 20 (Morning)

• Generative Discussions on ASME’s Growth Objectives

  Breakout Groups:
  
  • Defining Growth Objectives
  
  • Opportunities and challenges for growth under different economic scenarios
BOG Retreat Agenda

_Friday, July 20 (Afternoon)_

- Breakout Group Reports
- **ASME’s Integrated Strategy and Strategy Execution**
  - Discussion on implications of retreat learning on our strategic direction and execution on our strategy
- **Reflections on the Retreat and Next Steps**
  - Role of the Board in moving forward
  - Role of the SVPs/SMC in moving forward
- Adjourn

---

BOG Retreat

- Prepare to work hard
- Get to know your fellow leaders and their families
- Have fun
- Lay the groundwork for a great year

One if by land, two if by sea. Welcome to BOSTON
Preview

Management Surveys
Board of Governors’ Retreat
“Integrating Strategy and Building a High Performance Team”
July 18-20, 2012
The Charles Hotel
Cambridge, Massachusetts
Jess Dods

Abbreviated and Condensed Retreat Goals

• Engage in strategic and generative discussions about ASME’s strategic priorities
• Gain a deeper understanding of the value of an integrated strategy and the challenges, opportunities and implications for successful execution of the integrated strategy, e.g. the need for high performing teams.
• Develop greater understanding of ASME’s core competencies, growth opportunities and challenges and how they impact execution of the society’s strategic directions.
• Facilitate Board and leadership team building and collaboration.

Goals for this Presentation

• Introduce two management/organizational development tools
• Address the value of the tools to ASME’s Board and Senior leadership and staff
• Answer any questions about privacy or the survey instruments
Assessments and Organizational Performance

• The tools provide users with a common and complementary language that describes personality preferences and workplace behavioral styles at the individual level as well as how these styles interact
• There are no good or bad styles or types
• Knowing your own style helps you to understand your interactions with others.
• Knowing their style allows you both to tailor the interaction for greater effectiveness in the communication and the outcome
• Knowing the dominant styles in the organization help the organization explicitly determine whether this is the right style or there are changes necessary to get the work more effectively done
• To implement this, the ASME has contracted with Jess Dods MBA
• Jess is a Certified MBTI and DiSC administrator with significant experience in organizational performance consulting

Assessments and Organizational Performance

• President-Elect Marc Goldsmith wants to implement two highly regarded assessment tools in preparation for the Board Retreat
• The purpose is to improve communication, promote efficient use of time and enhance effectiveness of the Board
• The tools are the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and the DiSC Workplace Profile
• The tools are widely used and some of you may have experience with them
• Some of you, like Marc, may want to share your results, which is commonly done, to further enhance communication and enable people to work with other styles and types
Everything DiSC Workplace Profile

The DiSC Profile is a nonjudgmental tool for understanding behavioral types and personality styles. It helps people explore their behavior across four primary dimensions:

- **Dominance**: "D's" are direct, to the point and decisive. They tend to be strong-minded, strong-willed and enjoy challenges, taking action, and immediate results.

- **Influence**: "I's" tend to be optimistic and outgoing. They are social "people people" who prefer being on teams, sharing ideas, entertaining and energizing others.

- **Steadiness**: "S's" are empathetic and cooperative. They tend to be supportive, helpful team players and are often good listeners. They prefer being in the background, working in consistent and predictable ways. They also tend to be uncomfortable with change.

- **Conscientiousness**: "C's" tend to be concerned with details and cautious. They are often focused on quality. They plan ahead, check for accuracy, and act systematically.

Everything DiSC Workplace Profile continued

Participants will gain a better understanding of:

- Their behavioral strengths and preferences
- How to understand and value the behavioral strengths and preferences of others
- How to deal with conflict effectively
- How to improve communication skills
Everything DiSC Workplace Profile continued:
Sample results page for an individual participant

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

This is a widely used tool to help participants understand their personality preferences, and those of others, along 4 dimensions:

- How you interact with the world
- How you prefer to take in information
- How you prefer to make decisions
- Do you prefer order and structure or spontaneity

Participants are able to use this information, delivered confidentially, to increase self-awareness and improve interactions with colleagues
Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI)

Your Step I Results

INFJs tend to be quietly forceful, intense, conscientious, and concerned for others. They work with perseverance and originality. They are often motivated by a larger purpose or mission they want to accomplish. They are respected for their clear convictions regarding how to serve the common good.

Assessments and Organizational Performance

Privacy Concerns

• Participants are not required to disclose their results, which are sent directly to them in confidence. Sharing improves effectiveness.

• However, it is useful to note that these tools do not attempt to measure nor depict things that are negative or need to be "fixed"

• What these tools describe are preferences and styles that are observable in everyday interactions

• The benefit to the Participant is increased self-awareness and the awareness of others' preferences and styles in a common language

• The survey results will be reported in the aggregate, but a greater benefit accrues when styles are disclosed and shared

• If one uses the tools often, one can intuit the style without the survey
Schedule
Access codes will be sent for the Myers Briggs on May 10. The tool takes about 30 minutes to complete

We will have a webinar to discuss aggregated Myers-Briggs survey results on May 21 at 11:00 EDT

Access codes will be sent for the DiSC on June 29. The tool takes about 20 minutes to complete

We will have a webinar to discuss aggregated DiSC survey results on July 9 at 11:00 EDT

We intend to use the results at the Retreat to improve and enhance our discussions
Date Submitted: March 29, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19 & 20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: Sector Management Committee

Agenda Item Executive Summary: *(Do not exceed the space provided)*

The report updates the BOG on SMC activity and is for information. There is no presentation or action required.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: *(if appropriate)*

No Action

Attachments:
One
I. SMC Activities

The SMC held a retreat in February. Topics for discussion included a review of VOLT and the training needs of the Sectors and the Enterprise, selection of Vice Presidential candidates, and an opportunity for the Senior Vice Presidents to share their issues and better understand the challenges within each sector. Feedback has been positive and the retreat is planned to be an annual event.

Aging Infrastructure Assessment/ASME Complex Systems Failure

A funding proposal was submitted to the ELT for review. Feedback noted that the original scope was too ambitious and the proposal will be reworked for submission at a later date.

II. Sector Updates

Standards & Certification – Ken Balkey, June Ling, Bill Berger

Quarterly Highlights

- With ASME’s strategic focus on workforce development, S&C has increased its endeavors on direct personnel credentialing (training, training certificate programs, and personnel certification); thus, the Council on S&C took the action to withdraw from operating on the level of accreditation of personnel Certification bodies.
- ASME has taken the lead for a coalition of standards development organizations (SDO’s) in expressing concern over Public Law PL 112-90, the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011 (signed into law on Jan. 3, 2012). Section 24 of this bill prohibits the U.S. Dept. of Transportation from issuing regulations or guidelines incorporating by reference any documents that are not available for free on a website. ASME has submitted letters (endorsed by a number of SDO’s) to the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee; the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; and the Secretary of the Dept. of Transportation notifying them of the concerns with this provision. Meetings with key parties on the Hill are being scheduled. Some positive developments: engagement of the House Science Committee in exercising its jurisdiction over standards to preclude proliferation of similar wording in other draft House Transportation and Infrastructure legislation; and supportive reactions of other agencies regarding the standards’ community concerns.

There have been related discussions on the general subject of “reasonable availability” of standards incorporated by reference in regulations. ASME S&C and Government Relations continue to address these issues, including responding to Federal Register requests for comments.

- The leadership of The Board on Nuclear C&S (BNCS) Task Force on Design Basis and Response to Severe Accidents (Mr. Erler and Mr. Sanna) attended a special Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers (JSME) meeting on January 24, 2012 to review JSME and ASME progress in their respective Severe Accident Management (SAM)/Mitigation efforts. Also, JSME TG-SAM leadership met with ASME counterparts on February 7, 2012 in conjunction with BPV
Code Week in Houston. The Houston meeting focused on progress developments and continued discussion of JSME draft SAM documents.

The BNCS Task Force is planning a meeting in Washington D.C. at the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) Headquarters to advance the discussions on the inputs and participation of NEI and other nuclear SDOs.

Upcoming Activities/What’s on the Horizon?

- The Council on Standards and Certification is planning a Convocation of the Council and its Boards for October, 2012. In addition to regularly scheduled meetings of the leadership units of S&C, there will also be a one day plenary session that will focus on strategic trends, implications, etc. which all attendees will be encouraged to attend. The plenary session will be facilitated by the team of Goldberg/Scruggs.
- Expanded efforts to raise the visibility of standards among ME department heads, including how S&C might be able to encourage use of S&C modules, educate faculty on use of such modules and incorporation of standards in curricula. Incoming VP, Education is a member-at-large of the Council on S&C; thus collaborative efforts between S&C and Education should be enhanced.

Knowledge & Community – Tom Libertiny, Michael Ireland

Quarterly Highlights

- The reorganization task force met In Florida and also meets weekly
- The Board continues to hold monthly meetings
- Conference of Divisions and various Committee meetings were held at LTC
- Volunteers and staff took a lead in working with VOLT to organize much of LTC
- Staffing reorganization plan approved by ED

Upcoming Activities/What’s on the Horizon?

- Task Force will be asking Board to vote on recommendations for reorganization at April meeting.
- Several Conferences coming in Summer. Check asme.org for the one nearest to you or dearest to your heart.

Institutes – Dilip Ballal, Michael Ireland

Quarterly Highlights

- The IPTI Board met, as did each Division.
- The IGTI Board met.
- IGTI hired an Operations Director
- The 2012 Intersociety (8 societies participated) Carbon Management Technology Conference was held February 7-9 in Orlando, FL. The conference was declared a success and may be repeated two years from now. ASME President Vicki Rockwell gave a plenary talk and ED Tom Loughlin also attended the conference. Dilip Ballal served as the ASME representative on the Executive Committee. Mike Ireland and John Koehr were ASME staff representatives. Other ASME volunteers participated on the Program Committee.

Upcoming Activities/What’s on the Horizon?

- Offshore Technology Conference: 30 April—3 May, Houston, TX
- OMAE 12: Ocean, Offshore, Arctic Engineering Conference, 1-6 July 2012, Rio, Brazil
• International Pipeline Conference, 24-28 September, Calgary, Alberta, Canada
  2012 ASME Turbo Expo, 11-15 June, Copenhagen, Denmark

Public Affairs & Outreach – Stacey Swisher Harnetty, Phil Hamilton

• Engineers Week 2012: DiscoverE Educator Awards were conferred and DiscoverE Summit held at the Newseum in Washington, DC on February 22; Inspire Innovation Workshops were held in Houston, Clearwater Beach and New York City; support was provided for other EWeek activities including Future City, Family Day and the Global Marathon.

• Communications Effectiveness Study: A study on the effectiveness of the Public Information Department’s communications tools was launched. One-on-one interviews were conducted in February-March, and focus groups are being convened from key stakeholder groups throughout Q3; report expected in Q4.

• Engineering for Global Development/Engineering for Change: A 3 year plan for ASME’s new EGD program is underway; E4C is marking it’s one year anniversary, here’s a link to the year in review: http://bit.ly/zPNLrw; As of FY12 second quarter, E4C has received $296, 250 in external funding this fiscal year from groups including ASCE, OSA, UEF, IEEE Foundation and SWE.

• Position Papers: Government Relations released six position papers during the period ranging from comments on provisions of concern in the Pipeline Safety Act to a STEM Coalition letter on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. See http://www.asme.org/about-asme/advocacy-government-relations/position-statements

• Inter-Sector Committee on Federal R&D: In February, 25 members participated in briefings on the Administration’s Fiscal Year 2013 Research and Development Budget Request for key science agencies. During the afternoon, members met with agency officials from NSF, DOE, NIST, NASA, DOD, EPA and NIH to discuss research funding for engineering programs, as well as any new initiatives being proposed by the Administration. The analysis from these meetings will be utilized in developing position statements.

• Federal Fellows: Thomas Kurfess, Ph.D. began serving as an ASME Foundation Swanson Fellow at the Office of Science and Technology Policy in February 2012, where he’ll begin working on the Advanced Manufacturing Partnership. Dr. Kurfess served as a Professor and BMW Chair of Manufacturing and Director of Automotive Engineering at Clemson University.

• WISE Interns: ASME will be sponsoring three Washington Internships for Students of Engineering (WISE) interns this summer: Ann Motl, Brady Gilchrist, and Elsa Culler. Culler's internship is being funded by the ASME Environmental Engineering Division. Sixteen ASME student members applied for the three positions. The 2012 WISE program will run from June 4-August 3, 2012.

• 2012 ASME IShow: The ten semi-finalist teams – including one from the Indian Institute of Technology – have been selected to participate at the 6th Annual ASME IShow, scheduled to be held on June 2nd in conjunction with the Society’s Annual Meeting in Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

• 2012 International ME Education Conference: The ME Education Conference (aka: ME department heads conference) drew 60 participants to Clearwater Beach, FL, March 8-10.

• Vision 2030 Mechanical Engineering Education Advocacy/Implementation Launch: The V2030 project has resulted in 7 strategic impact areas for ASME impact over the next few years out as far as the next decade. Chief among them are (A) increasing the number of ME Departments whose curriculum features a discernable “design-build spine”, (B) the infusion of Professors of Practice/Clinical Professors into the faculty demographic of ME departments, (C) the cultivation of a visible leadership and community of clinical and adjunct professors of practice as a core impact group and voice at the Education Board table, (D) the infusion of Engineering Codes

ASME will be the essential resource for mechanical engineers and other technical professionals throughout the world for solutions that benefit humankind.
and Standards into the ME/MET undergraduate curriculum, and (E) beginning to expand the conversation and continuation of V2030 research in Asia-Pacific, Latin America and India.

- **Inspire Innovation Workshops for Middle School Teachers:** Workshops conducted in conjunction with the recent ME Education Conference and the Pinellas County Science Center and the International Summit on the Teaching Profession in New York City attracted a total of 73 teachers. This brings the number of teachers reached in FY 12 by our workshops to 188, nearly double last year’s number. Additional workshops are scheduled for Las Vegas, NV, May 5 and two (English/French) in Montreal, Canada, June 2.

- **Student and Early Career Taskforce:** The team had a 2 day retreat in Houston TX on Jan 12-13, 2012. The team discussed the feedback from the stakeholders collected during committee’s and board’s meeting at IMECE and via teleconferences, revisited assessment of the existing programs for Students and Early Career Engineers and developed a framework for the new Sector organizational structure. The retreat outcomes provides a foundation for the taskforce team update to BOG on February 16, 2012 and subsequent webinar to be held on April 3.

**Upcoming activities/What’s on the Horizon?**

- **ASME Scholarships:** The Board on Education oversees the ASME Scholarship application/selection process. Deadline for applications is April 1 with 389 scholarship applications submitted to date – almost triple the number of FY 11 applications. The application marketing and completion efforts have been increased to reverse a downward slope in applications over the past two years and in response to a request of the ASME Foundation as a measure of making the case for more scholarship endowments.

- **ABET Program Evaluator (PEV) Selection:** The selection process has begun for the annual infusion of new ASME/ABET degree program Evaluators. There are currently 62 applicants for about 12 slots. Once selected, the new potential PEV’s undergo a process of pre-work and workshop training prior to serving as Observers on visiting accreditation teams this Fall. If the evaluated performance of the new trainees is satisfactory they will join the ASME cadre of active PEV’s and be assigned ad formal accreditation team members in Fall of 2013.

- **Pan American Convention of Engineering XXXIII UPADI 2012:** ASME has been involved in producing the Education and other sessions for the UPADI (Pan American Institutions of Engineers) conference in Havana, Cuba from April 9-14, 2012. In addition to the principal drivers, Reggie Vashon and Mike Michaud, the ASME delegation is made up of the leadership of the ASME Education Vision 2030 project: Robert Warrington (also Chair of the UPADI education Committee), Allan Kirkpatrick, Scot Danielson, Richard Smith and Thomas Perry.

**III. VOLT Academy – Progress report submitted by Bill Cousins**

**Quarterly Highlights**

- The Leadership Training Conference was held March 1-4, 2012 in New Orleans, LA. There were a total of 412 registered attendees (this includes staff, LTC Planning Committee and other groups. The attendees represented 26 divisions, 131 sections (this number includes all delegate attendees), and included 40 students, 24 Early Career Engineers and 11 ECLIPSE Interns. 84 non-US attendees represented 34 countries, up from 69 last year. The age group of 20-34 year-olds accounted for a total of 152 attendees, up from 103 last year, so we continue our focus and success in attracting this age group.

- A pre-LTC workshop entitled “Innovation for the 21st Century Leaders” was sponsored by the VOLT Academy featuring Joel Barker, a noted futurist. The workshop was attend by 54 volunteers and received a 3.51 rating on a 4.0 scale.
• The ECLIPSE Interns attending LTC were invited to a reception and dinner hosted by the ASME President and Executive Director on Friday, March 2nd. On Saturday, March 3rd, the group attended a briefing related to their new and outgoing positions as ECLIPSE Interns. This was facilitated by the ECLIPSE Intern Program Committee chair and vice chair.
• The VOLT Academy Budget Preparation Meeting was held on February 3, 2012 in Hartford.

Upcoming Activities/What’s on the Horizon?
• Nominating Committee Training is scheduled for April 11th. This is the second of two sessions held annually, one in the Fall and one in the Spring. This training session is to brief the NC on their responsibilities, along with providing knowledge on different aspects of ASME and present issues, programs, goals and directions.
• The Board of Governors Briefing is scheduled for Wednesday, April 18th from 10:00 am – 11:30 am. This briefing is for any volunteer seeking a seat on the Board of Governors, and will highlight the specific position requirements and operational duties.
• The Nominating Committee (NC) Briefing is scheduled for Wednesday, May 9th from 12:00 pm – 2:15 pm. This briefing will include the PET as well as the Sector Senior Vice Presidents. The briefing will serve as a vehicle to provide the NC members an overview of the open positions, the necessary qualifications of applicants and current background information on the sectors.
• The Presidential Candidate Briefing is scheduled for Thursday, May 10th from 8:00 am – 2:45 pm. This briefing will include the PET and the sector Managing Directors. The briefing is designed to give candidates a real-world overview of the office of the ASME President along with details on the position responsibilities.

IV. Events Committee (EC) – Progress report submitted by Jim Coaker

Quarterly Highlights
• Through 3rd quarter FY 12, EC has reviewed and approved 18 events
  o Several “cautionary” notes sent to planning committees re: expectations for future events and compliance with P12.1 (existing MOUs have a finite life!)
• One proposed event was not approved – division has appealed the decision.
  o At issue is drive for more specific guidance re: use of logo when ASME is not involved in “technical” or financial production of an event (example: co-sponsored event for which a division recommends support but is not otherwise involved) EC balance appears to be working effectively.
• Liaison from Events Task Force and chair of CPC continue to be valuable resources.
• Staff support continues to be top shelf.
• Lessons learned and mid-course calibrations
  o EPAT system has added a 3rd category – “Request to Revise” This gives event proposers an opportunity to address EC review concerns and alter system input, as opposed to setting rejection in concrete
  o Staff and IT are working on several committee suggestions to streamline process

Challenges &/Opportunities/ What’s on the Horizon?
• Based on appeal concerns (2nd bullet), EC needs guidance re: use of logo. This is not directly addressed in P12.1. The issue is complex and warrants focused attention / resolution. EC senses a major shift in paradigm, which does not simply happen.
Date Submitted: April 2, 2012  
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012  

To: Board of Governors  
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other)  
Presented by: COR  
Agenda Title: Proposed Appointments  

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)  
Proposed appointments reviewed by the COR on April 2, 2012  

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)  
Approve the proposed appointments.  

Attachments: Appointments listing.
### PROPOSED APPOINTMENTS TO ASME UNIT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council on Standards and Certification</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Appointment Position/Title</th>
<th>Appointment Term/Category</th>
<th>Initial Appointment</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council on Standards and Certification</td>
<td>Louis Bialy</td>
<td>Member-at-Large</td>
<td>6/2012 to 6/2015</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Vice President, Safety Codes and Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Standards and Certification</td>
<td>Stuart Cameron</td>
<td>Member-at-Large</td>
<td>6/2012 to 6/2015</td>
<td>Reappointment 6/2010 to 6/2012</td>
<td>Member, Council on Standards and Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Standards and Certification</td>
<td>Mohammad Hosni</td>
<td>Member-at-Large</td>
<td>6/2012 to 6/2015</td>
<td>Reappointment 6/2009 to 6/2012</td>
<td>Member, Council on Standards and Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Standards and Certification</td>
<td>Dongil Kwon</td>
<td>Member-at-Large</td>
<td>6/2012 to 6/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Member, BPV III, Korea International Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Standards and Certification</td>
<td>Wilfred LaRochelle</td>
<td>Member-at-Large</td>
<td>6/2012 to 6/2015</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Vice President, Conformity Assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROPOSED APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE ORGANIZATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outside Organization</th>
<th>Nominee</th>
<th>Appointment Position/Title</th>
<th>Appointment Term/Category</th>
<th>Initial Appointment</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Conference on Creep</td>
<td>Mohammed Zikry</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>3/2012 – 6/2015</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Materials Division Chair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Fellow Review Committee of the Committee of Past Presidents has recommended a change to the requirements to become an ASME Fellow. If the Board endorses this change, a petition signed by 20 Corporate Members must be brought to the Business Meeting at the Annual Meeting. If approved at the Business Meeting, the amendment will appear on the ballot sent to the membership later in the year.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Recommend endorsement by the Board of Governors that the requirement of 10 years of continuous service be changed: delete the word continuous and modify C3.1.4 of the Constitution to read:

A Fellow, one who has attained a membership grade of distinction, at the time of advancement shall be a corporate member of the Society, shall have been responsible for significant engineering achievements, and shall have not less than 10 years of active practice—and shall have 10 years of continuous corporate membership.

Attachments: Statement by Fellow Review Committee Chair Susan Skemp
Statement from Susan Skemp, Chair of the Fellow Review Committee:

We considered a number of potential pitfalls and focused a good amount of discussion on the concern more about the potential issue of individuals being able to “buy back” their 10 years with solely the intent of being able to be elevated to a Fellow. This does not provide for that to occur.

The interpretation of 10 years of “Continuous Service” under the By-Law as it reads currently does not stipulate the timeframe that the 10 years has to occur, even if it was 30 years ago. It requires, however, that at the time of elevation, a Fellow, one who has attained a membership grade of distinction, at the time of advancement shall be a corporate member of the Society, shall have been responsible for significant engineering achievements, and shall have not less than 10 years of active practice, and 10 years of continuous corporate membership.

The motion for modification to the By-law requires that they have 10 years (total) of corporate membership, plus all the other stipulations remain the same and have been met but removes the word continuous.
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Date Submitted: March 30, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other)
Presented by: PAO
Agenda Title: By-Law Revision B5.3

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

The PAO Council requests changing the name of the Diversity Strategy Committee to the Diversity and Inclusion Strategy Committee as approved by the Committee on Organization and Rules on November 28, 2011.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Revise B5.3 as attached

Attachments: Word document
B5.3 PUBLIC AFFAIRS AND OUTREACH SECTOR

B5.3.1.1 The Public Affairs and Outreach Sector, under the direction of the Board of Governors, is responsible for the coordinated outreach to industry, government, education, and the public as well as initiatives that address diversity and humanitarian programs. The Public Affairs and Outreach Sector will maintain a current Sector Operation Guide that will contain operational details of the Public Affairs and Outreach Sector that are not in these By-Laws.

B5.3.1.2 The Public Affairs and Outreach Sector shall be led by a Council that consists of the following voting membership: a Senior Vice President as Chair; two members-at-large; the Vice Presidents for the following Boards: Education; Global Outreach; Government Relations; and Students and Early Career and the Chairs of the following: Industry Advisory Board; Innovation Committee; Strategic Issues Committee; Diversity and Inclusion Strategy Committee. The Associate Executive Director, Public Affairs and Outreach, is a non-voting member.

B5.3.1.3 The incoming Senior Vice President, Public Affairs and Outreach shall be nominated by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council from among its past or present volunteer members for appointment by the Board of Governors for a term of three years. In the event that a past or present volunteer member is not available from the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, then the Council shall defer to the Board of Governors for the selection. Vice Presidents who have been elected to a term that extends more than one year into a new term of the Senior Vice President of Public Affairs and Outreach are not eligible to become the Senior Vice President.

B5.3.1.4 The members-at-large shall be appointed by the Board of Governors, as recommended by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council. The term of the members-at-large shall be one year.

B5.3.2.1 The following Boards will report directly to the Public Affairs and Outreach Council: Board on Education; Board on Global Outreach; Board on Government Relations; Industry Advisory Board; and Board on Students and Early Career.

B5.3.2.2 The Board on Education, under the direction of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, is responsible for the activities of the Society that relate to engineering education and pre-college education. The Board shall consist of a Vice President, Education as Chair and a membership as determined by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council.

B5.3.2.3 The Board on Global Outreach, under the direction of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, is responsible for the activities of the Society that relate to public awareness of engineering and humanitarian programs. The Board shall consist of a Vice President, Global Outreach as Chair and a membership as determined by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council.
B5.3.2.4 The Board on Government Relations, under the direction of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, is responsible for the development of programs for interaction between the Society and government at all levels. The Board shall consist of a Vice President, Government Relations as Chair and a membership as determined by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council. The Board on Government Relations shall recommend policies and procedures, and supervise activities that involve Society interaction with government entities.

B5.3.2.5 The Board on Students and Early Career, under the direction of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, is responsible for development of programs that relate to students and early career engineers. The Board shall consist of a Vice President, Students and Early Career as Chair and a membership as determined by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council.

B5.3.2.6 The Industry Advisory Board, under the direction of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, is responsible for providing a voice for industry within ASME through the communication and advocacy of industry needs. The Industry Advisory Board shall consist of a Chair and Vice Chair, appointed by the Senior Vice President of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council.

B5.3.2.7 The following committees shall report directly to the Public Affairs and Outreach Council: Innovation Committee; Strategic Issues Committee and Diversity and Inclusion Strategy Committee.

B5.3.2.8 The Innovation Committee, under the direction of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, shall provide insight through internal and external sources for innovations that further ASME strategic objectives. The Committee will consist of a Chair, appointed by the Senior Vice President, Public Affairs and Outreach and a membership as determined by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council.

B5.3.2.9 The Strategic Issues Committee, under the direction of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, shall provide internal and external sources to support environmental scanning, competitive intelligence and best practices, and keep the Society informed on strategic issues, opportunities, trends and initiatives. The committee shall consist of a Chair, appointed by Senior Vice President, Public Affairs and Outreach and a membership, as determined by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council.

B5.3.2.10 The Diversity and Inclusion Strategy Committee, under the direction of the Public Affairs and Outreach Council, shall provide insight and advice into promoting diversity within ASME and mechanical engineering. The Committee will consist of a chair, appointed by the Senior Vice President, Public Affairs and Outreach and a membership, as determined by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council.
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Date Submitted: March 30, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: April 19-20, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) Public Affairs and Outreach Council
Presented by: Stacey Swisher Harnetty
Agenda Title: Revision to Society Policy P-15.2 Engineers’ Licensing

Agenda Item Executive Summary: (Do not exceed the space provided)

The issue of the “Industrial Exemption” for practicing engineers is getting more attention in the engineering profession.

An industrial exemption applies to engineers who design products that are sold (or have the potential to be sold) outside the jurisdiction where they are produced, as well as the equipment used to produce the product. Issues related to the public’s safety and health are generally addressed by product standards issued by organizations such as ASME.

Changes to Section III.A and a new Section III.B in ASME’s Society Policy P-15.2, as shown in the attached are proposed.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Approve Changes recommended by the Public Affairs and Outreach Council which were also approved by the Committee on Organization and Rules

Attachments: Revision to Society Policy P-15.2
SOCIETY POLICY
ENGINEERS' LICENSING

I. PREAMBLE

ASME recognizes engineering in the varied disciplines as a learned profession that affects each individual and the public at large to a continuously increasing extent. This Society Policy is intended to recognize both the rapid changes taking place in the utilization of engineers and changes in the organization of engineering service groups. ASME regards the work and service performed by engineers to include responsibility for contributing to the betterment of the human experience, including the health, safety, welfare, and property of the public, and in so doing, engineers accept their share of responsibility on any project or design with which they are involved.

II. POLICY

ASME endorses licensing as being in the best interest of the public and the profession. ASME encourages licensed engineers to identify themselves with the appropriate title in all communications and acknowledges that such identification is in the public and professional interest. The awareness by the public and by the engineering community engendered by licensing will enhance engineering as a single and noble profession.

III. RECOMMENDATION

ASME recommends:

A. That any person in responsible charge of the practice of engineering be a legally licensed engineer except where state statutes allow for exemptions.

B. That licensed engineers and those acting under a state's industrial exemption be cognizant of the importance of safeguarding public safety and health through the use of product and service standards issued by government, industry groups, and by organizations such as ASME.

C. That legally licensed engineers be addressed or referred to in all written communications or publications as such by use of the appropriate title.

DC. That ASME members that practice engineering become licensed as soon as qualified so as to join members of other societies in enhancing engineering as one, single profession.

ED. That all qualified engineers who are educators become licensed and that they include in the engineering education curricula material concerning professional licensing.

FE. That each section of ASME present one program annually at a section meeting on the subject of engineering licensing and cooperate with authorized licensing bodies and other Professional Societies in offering courses for examination preparation.
IV. IMPLEMENTATION

A. ASME encourages all practicing members of other professional and technical societies to become licensed as soon as qualified.

B. ASME encourages all engineers to continue to update their own competence to keep pace with the growing demands for professional and responsible leadership.

The Board of Governors of ASME, having endorsed the concept of engineering licensing by all those who practice the art and science of mechanical engineering, further supports the concept that a regular program of technical and professional renewal, generally termed Continuing Professional Competency, be required for the continuation of licensure.

While the specific requirements for Continuing Professional Competency remain the province of legally authorized licensing bodies, ASME is supportive of the Model Rule written by the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying for implementing this position.

C. ASME encourages all engineers to accept the responsibility for their work and their portion of any design or product as a distinct mark of their professionalism.

D. ASME offers its facilities, liaison, encouragement and financial support to the efforts to obtain the maximum possible uniformity in licensing procedures and requirements, including assistance in preparation of professional examinations.

E. ASME charges the Public Affairs and Outreach Council its Center for Career and Professional Advancement to prepare or select annually an information article on licensing to be published in the MECHANICAL ENGINEERING Magazine, ASME NEWS, or on asme.org.

F. ASME directs the attention of all its members and other engineers to the need for thoughtful concern with licensing problems in the future.

G. Society Policy P-14.12 indicates specific licenses that are recognized as equal to the eight years of active practice requirement for any grade of Society Membership and to the five years of responsible charge requirement for Member grade.

Responsibility: Public Affairs and Outreach Council
Reassigned from Centers Sector Board /Center for Career and Professional Advancement
Reassigned from Council on Member Affairs/Board on Professional Practice & Ethics 6/12/05

Adopted: April 6, 1936
Revised:

- February 9, 1970
- December 4, 1975
- June 25, 1980
- March 21, 1984
  (editorial changes 8/88)
- December 5, 1991
- March 13, 1998
- March 18, 2000
- June 12, 2005
  (editorial changes 4/09)
Date Submitted: April 3rd  
BOG Meeting Date: April 19th

To: Board of Governors  
From: COFI
Presented by: Reginald Vachon
Agenda Title: Member Dues Increase

Agenda Item Executive Summary:

COFI has voted to recommend that the Board of Governors approve a dues increase.

COFI supports a recommendation to increase dues to $144.00 to the Board of Governors.

Proposed motion for BOG Action:

Consent item: COFI recommends approval to increase October 2012 dues to $144.00

Attachments:

Dues Increase.ppt
ASME Membership - Dues Increase Proposal

The Committee on Finance and Investment recommends a member dues increase:

October 2011 Member dues: $140.75

Change in CPI (January 2012 vs. January 2011): +2.9252%
Per Bureau of Labor Statistics, CPI: All Urban Consumers NSA

Maximum allowable dues: $144.87
per ASME Constitution and By-laws (C.9.1.1)

Recommendation for October 2012: $144.00
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To: Board of Governors
From: COFI
Presented by: Reginald Vachon
Agenda Title: E4C Funding

Agenda Item Executive Summary:

E4C presented a funding proposal requesting $250,000 of financial support from the ASME Initiative Fund.

The $250,000 provides 2012 operational support and is consistent with the IEEE commitment of the same amount.

This proposal is recommended to the BOG as a consent item.

Proposed motion for BOG Action:

Consent Item: COFI recommends approval of $250,000 of Initiative Fund support to E4C.

Attachments:

E4C Initiative Fund Proposal.docx
Proposal year: FY 2012
Proposal amount: $250,000

Background

E4C has just marked its one year anniversary, and it's off to a good start with its platform, strategic alliance strategy, linkages with universities and marketing/communications efforts. Despite very limited resources, the goals that have been set for membership sign-ups and usage levels have been achieved for this year. Phase II strategy is currently being developed based on our learning's to date.

The current business model continues to focus on building the extensive E4C community and robust content necessary for programmatic growth and flexibility, while securing a stable financial foundation through funds from ASME, IEEE, other associations, and foundations. Phase 2 strategy will drive the design of appropriate business models that could include new revenue generating streams (i.e. subscriptions, derivative products, etc.) at a future state, in addition to revenue from corporate sponsors, association sponsors and foundation grants.

Our financial model reflects two scenarios:

- Operations– supporting the current infrastructure
- Growth- building elements that will help increase impact in scale and scope

Beyond the initial investment of $1 million each, ASME and IEEE have committed to an acceptable and predictable level of investment (~$250,000/year/per organization) to ensure continued functioning of E4C, allow for sustainability and growth, while minimizing risk. Both organizations have also committed to in-kind contributions in the form of content, reputation and human resources. External funding will be used to enable the growth scenario, which includes program development.

This business/financial model has been approved by COFI at their March 2011 meeting and the BOG in June 2011.

Rationale for $250,000

The E4C LLC operations management and strategic execution requires funding and support. In addition to the in-kind support that both IEEE and ASME provides, the following sources of funds are critical for the development and delivery of programs and consistent with our original commitment.

- $250,000 ASME Contribution (operations support)
- $250,000 IEEE Contribution (operations support)
- $650,000 external funding via IEEE Foundation, ASME Foundation, etc. for operations and programmatic support over FY12 and 13
- $105,000 Sponsor Revenue (operations support)

The funds will support the following functions:

- Staff salaries, travel & sustenance
- Web development and maintenance
- Content development
- Marketing & communications
- Legal
- Partnership development and fundraising