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37. **Call to Order:**

On February 16, 2012, a Web conference/Live Meeting of the Board of Governors of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers was held at ASME Headquarters, Three Park Avenue, New York, New York. A quorum being present, the meeting was called to order by the President at 12:00 PM Eastern Standard Time. Attendance was as follows (all volunteers by conference telephone; all staff in person except as noted):

**Board of Governors**
- President: Victoria A. Rockwell
- Immediate Past President: Robert T. Simmons
- President-Elect: Marc W. Goldsmith

**Other Officers**
- Senior Vice Presidents: Kenneth R. Balkey, Standards and Certification
  - Dilip R. Ballal, Institutes
  - Thomas G. Libertiny, Knowledge and Community
  - Stacey Swisher Harnetty, Public Affairs and Outreach
- Vice President: William J. Wepfer, Education
- Secretary and Treasurer: Webb Marner
- Executive Director: Thomas G. Loughlin
- Assistant Secretary: John Delli Venneri (also General Counsel)
- Assistant Treasurer: Michael Weis (also Deputy Executive Director)

**Board of Governors Elect**
- John Etter
- Bernard Hrubala
- Richard Laudenat

**Board Committee Chairs**
- Karen Thole: Chair, Committee on Honors (COH)
- Reginald Vachon: Chair, Committee on Finance and Investment (COFI)
- Sam Zamrik: Chair, Committee of Past Presidents (CPP)

**Corporate Counsel**
- John Sare
38. **Adoption of the Agenda:** The Board

   VOTED: to adopt the agenda as circulated on February 2, 2012.

39. **Announcements:**

   The President welcomed all to the meeting and recognized Secretary and Treasurer Nominee Warren DeVries as participating in the meeting.

40. **Discussion Items:** The Board

   VOTED: to move into open session, as if in the Committee of the Whole.

The Board heard reports concerning and discussed the following items:
Report on Sector Management Committee by Marc Goldsmith (Agenda Appendix 3.1.2 and Minutes Appendix VIII); 990 Tax Form by Michael Weis (Agenda Appendix 2.2.2 and Minutes Appendix I); HQ Task Force Update by Thomas Pestorius (Agenda Appendix 2.2.3 and Minutes Appendix II); Pipeline Bill – HR2845 by June Ling and Philip Hamilton (Agenda Appendix 2.2.4 and Minutes Appendix III); Student and Early Career Development Update by Stacey Swisher Harnetty and Cynthia Stong (Agenda Appendix 2.2.5 and Minutes Appendix IV); Knowledge and Community Update by Thomas Libertiny (Agenda Appendix 2.2.6 and Minutes Appendix V); Leadership Task Force by Julio Guerrero (Agenda Appendix 2.2.7 and Minutes Appendix VI); and E-Week Update by Victoria Rockwell (Agenda Appendix 2.2.8 and Minutes Appendix VII).

Following the close of the Discussion Items, the Board

VOTED: to move into formal session.

41. **Items for Receipt:** The Board

   VOTED: to receive the following items: (1) Treasurer’s Report; (2) Sector Management Committee Report (Agenda Appendix 3.1.2 and Minutes Appendix VIII); (3) Nominating Committee’s Report on Allowance for One Vice President Candidate (Agenda Appendix 3.1.3 and Minutes Appendix IX); and (4) ASME.org Task Force Update (Agenda Appendix 3.1.4 and Minutes Appendix X).

42. **Items for Action:** The Board

   VOTED: to approve the following items: (1) Minutes from the Meeting on November 12, 2011; (2) Proposed Appointments (Agenda Appendix 3.2.3.1 and Minutes Appendix XI); (3) First reading of the revision of By-Law B5.3 (Agenda Appendix 3.2.3.2.1 and Minutes Appendix XII); (4) Elevation of the Nemat-Nasser Early Career Award from a Divisional Award to a Society Award (Agenda Appendix 3.2.4.1 and Minutes Appendix XIII); (5) Defined Contribution Pension/Thrift Plan Amendments (Agenda Appendix 3.2.5 and Minutes Appendix XIV); (6) Updated Position Paper on Education Requirement for Licensure (Agenda Appendix 3.2.6 and Minutes Appendix XV); (7) Updated Position Paper on Diversity and Inclusion (Agenda Appendix 3.2.7 and Minutes Appendix XVI); and (8) Revision – ABET ME Degree Program Accreditation Criteria (Agenda Appendix 3.2.8 and Minutes Appendix XVII).
43. **Dates of Future Meetings.** The Board reviewed the dates of future meetings and approved meeting dates and times as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DAY</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>April 19, 2012(a)</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>12:00 PM – 1:30 PM</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 20, 2012(a)</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>8:00 AM – 1:00 PM</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3, 2012(a)</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 11:30 AM</td>
<td>Montreal, Quebec, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2012(b)</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10:00 AM – 11:30 AM</td>
<td>Montreal, Quebec, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11:30 AM – 3:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 18-20, 2012(b)</td>
<td>Wednesday to Friday</td>
<td>RETREAT TBD</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>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:30 PM – 5:00 PM</td>
<td></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>Houston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive Session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:30 AM – 4:30 PM</td>
<td></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>
</tbody>
</table>

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

44. **Contingency Time**

There was no discussion during contingency time. President Rockwell said that questions that were not answered during the meeting could be e-mailed to her.

45. **Adjournment:** The meeting was adjourned at 12:58 PM.

Wilbur (Webb) J. Marner
Secretary
ASME Board of Governors
Agenda Item
Cover Memo

Date Submitted: January 30, 2012
BOG Meeting Date:  February 16, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: Finance and Legal
Presented by: Webb Marner, Michael Weis, John Delli Venneri
Agenda Title: 990 Presentation

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

For information:  FY11 990 Process Update

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Attachments:
ASME Board of Governors
IRS Form 990 Update
February 16, 2012

Webb Marner, ASME Treasurer
Mike Weis, Asst Treasurer & CFO
John Delli Veneri, Managing Dir - Legal

Why did the IRS Redesign the 990?

• To increase transparency of tax-exempt organizations
• To promote compliance of tax-exempt organizations
• To minimize burden on filing organizations

Old 990 was numbers based
New 990 is more governance related
2009 New 990 Requirements

- Governing body – given opportunity to review before filing
- Changes in activities and governing documents
- Transactions with and among insiders
- Compensation
- Selected policies and procedures
- How key governance, financial, and mission policies are made public
- Activities outside of the United States

Areas for Your Special Attention

- Part VI – Governance and policies
- Schedule J – Compensation of key employees
Conflict of Interest Form

• Disclosure form is a statement required for BoG voting members, officers (e.g., ED, Treasurer, Asst Treasurer), & key employees.
• Annual disclosure form regarding conflict of interest must be signed – within 2 weeks

990 Timeline (FY11)

Dates are tentative

• May 2011 – Meetings with Auditors
• July/August – Audit is conducted
• Aug 25 – Audit Committee/COFI Reviews
• Sept 15 – BOG Approves Audited Statements
• Mid Feb – 990 Review Committee Conf Call
• Late Feb – BOG Conference Call
• March 5 – 990 posted on BOG secured site
• March 16 - Disclosure form signed & submitted
• March 26 – Meeting with auditors to finalize
• March 31 – Marks Paneth electronic filing of 990
ASME Board of Governors
Agenda Item
Cover Memo

Date Submitted: January 30, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: February 16, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: HQ Task Force
Presented by: Tom Pestorius
Agenda Title: HQ Task Force Update

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

This presentation will provide an update of the current status of the ASME NY Headquarters project.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Attachments:
ASME HQ Facilities Assessment Task Force

BOG Update – February 2012

Tom Pestorius

ASME HQ Facilities Task Force Phase 3 Update

• NYC HQ Project
  – Phase 3 - Implementation
  – Timelines and Impacts

• Next Steps
**Phase 3 - Update**

**Current Phase**

- Phase 3 is the implementation phase for the next HQ location. It coordinates the efforts for design and construction. The Task Force will monitor and report on the progress of the project.

**Completed Phases**

- Phase 2 explored and evaluated early lease opportunities that met the business requirements for the next ASME HQ location. The phase was completed in April 2011 with a Task Force recommendation to the BOG to enter into a lease with 2 Park Avenue in New York, NY.

- Phase 1 defined the scope of the project and concluded with a report to the BOG in April 2010.

**Phase 3 - Update**

**HQ Timelines & Impacts**

- **FY2012** A project timeline and plan for design, construction, and relocation is completed.
- The Facilities Task Force and VVA (Consulting Project Management Team) conducted a conference call on detailed cost estimates
  - Cost estimates are higher than BOG approved in June
  - Cost estimates are competitive with current market conditions and moves
    - ASME’s negotiated lease rates are well below today’s market rates
- ELT has completed site visits of architectural/furniture alternatives.
- RFP’s for Furniture, IT/AV, and other services are in progress.
- A subset of ELT continues to have weekly meetings with architects and project management consultant.
Phase 3 - Update

Next Steps

• Revise cost estimates, budgets, and timelines as the HQ project becomes more defined. (ongoing throughout RFP process)
• Set up an in-person face-to-face meeting between the BOG and VVA to review and discuss project.
• Continue to keep COFI and the BOG informed. (ongoing)
ASME Board of Governors
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Date Submitted: Date Submitted: 
BOG Meeting Date: February 16, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: Standards & Certification
Presented by: June Ling/Phil Hamilton
Agenda Title: Pipeline Bill – HR.2845

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

HR 2845, the Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011, was signed into law on January 3, 2012 (PL 112-90). The bill stems in part from the September 9, 2010 natural gas pipeline explosion in San Bruno, California that resulted in eight deaths and the destruction of 38 residences.

Section 24 of the bill prohibits the U.S. Department of Transportation from issuing regulations or guidelines incorporating by reference any documents that are not available for free on a website. Current federal pipeline regulations reference standards from 10 private sector standards developing organizations (SDOs), including nine ASME standards.

ASME has submitted letters to the Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee; the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and the Secretary of the Department of Transportation notifying them of our concerns about this provision. The letters were endorsed by a number of SDOs.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Information only.

Attachments:

Section 24 of HR 2845 and Impacted ASME Standards
HR 2845 Coalition Letters (Senate, House, DOT)
**H.R. 2845 - The Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011**

“An Act to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for enhanced safety and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, to provide for enhanced reliability in the transportation of the Nation’s energy products by pipeline, and for other purposes.”

**Excerpt**

**SEC. 24. LIMITATION ON INCORPORATION OF DOCUMENTS BY REFERENCE.**

Section 60102, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

(p) Limitation on Incorporation of Documents by Reference- Beginning 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary may not issue guidance or a regulation pursuant to this chapter that incorporates by reference any documents or portions thereof unless the documents or portions thereof are made available to the public, free of charge, on an Internet Web site.

**ASME Standards Currently Referenced by Office of Pipeline Safety Regulations**

B16.1 – Gray Iron Pipe Flanges and Flanged Fittings, Classes 25, 125 and 150
B16.5 – Pipe Flanges and Flanged Fittings, NPS ½ to NPS 24
B31G – Manual for Determining Remaining Strength of Corroded Pipelines
B31.8 – Gas Transmission and Distribution Piping Systems
B31.8S – Managing System Integrity of Gas Pipelines
BPV Section I – Power Boilers
BPV Section VIII Div. 1 – Rules for Construction of Pressure Vessels
BPV Section VIII Div. 2 – Alternative Rules for Construction of Pressure Vessels
BPV Section IX – Welding and Brazing Qualifications
January 17, 2012

The Honorable John D. Rockefeller IV  The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison
Chairman  Ranking Member
Commerce, Science, and Transportation  Commerce, Science, and Transportation
254 Russell Senate Office Building  560 Dirksen Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20515  Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairman Rockefeller and Ranking Member Kay Bailey Hutchison:

As you know, Congress recently passed H.R. 2845, the “Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011” (“Pipeline Bill”), partly in response to the September 9, 2010 San Bruno pipeline explosion. Unfortunately, the Senate acted on this bill before stakeholders were able to engage with your Committee on the issue of standards incorporated by reference into regulation. The undersigned organizations write to express our strong concern that Section 24 of H.R. 2845 could adversely impact public safety, contrary to the intent of Congress, by placing practical barriers on the Department of Transportation’s ability to rely on the state of the art technical standards written by standards developing organizations (SDOs). Further, it would set a precedent that severely undermines the financial ability of SDOs to develop and make their standards available for government use.

As not-for-profit organizations, we have long supported the relationship between the public and private sectors through our continued development of voluntary consensus standards. These standards reduce the costs of goods and services; enhance safety, health, and quality of life; and facilitate innovation, trade, and competitiveness. Private-sector SDOs also substantially reduce the costs of government by providing a consistent and technically sound basis for regulation. Moreover, many SDOs underwrite the considerable cost of standards development and maintenance activities largely through the publication and sale of their standards on a reasonable basis.

Section 24 of H.R. 2845 prohibits the reference of any standard in a guidance document or regulation promulgated under the Pipeline Bill “unless the documents or portions thereof are made available free of charge on an Internet Website.” This provision represents a radical departure from the long established federal policy, and practice, of promoting the federal government use of private sector standards; in operation it provides a not-for-profit SDO with the dilemma of either (1) nullifying the value of its intellectual property; or (2) limiting the public...
safety impact of the standard by prohibiting its reference in the Department’s regulations. Either way, the SDO is impeded from accomplishing its charitable safety mission, and the public interest in effective safety regulation is thwarted.

Existing policy regarding the use of private sector standards in regulation has been established by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-119 (copy enclosed), which is a partial codification of the provisions contained within the “National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act” (P.L. 104-113). This policy aims to:

- eliminate the cost to the Government of developing its own standards and decrease the cost of goods procured and the burden of complying with agency regulation;
- provide incentives and opportunities to establish standards that serve national needs;
- encourage long-term growth for U.S. enterprises and promote efficiency and economic competition through harmonization of standards; and
- further the policy of reliance upon the private sector to supply Government needs for goods and services.

Recognizing the importance of copyright as a funding mechanism for the development of standards, the OMB Circular directs federal agencies to observe and protect the SDO’s copyrights, and agencies have done so successfully for decades. Section 24 of the Pipeline Bill will jeopardize the Department of Transportation’s ability to fulfill the important goals served by the OMB Circular. Further, if SDOs are unable, due to the financial impact of Section 24, to make their standards available for DOT adoption, it may result in:

- duplicative and potentially conflicting regulations and industry practices;
- reduced responsiveness, resulting in gaps and barriers to technology commercialization; and
- reduced stakeholder diversity in standards development.

SDOs have and will remain committed to providing wide and reasonable availability of their standards and to working with federal agencies to provide both pre- and post- adoption access to standards through a variety of means, appropriate to the many circumstances in which standards are adopted and used. But, in order to sustain funding for the development of private sector standards and to allow federal agencies to choose those standards that best meet the needs of public safety, a flexible approach is required. Such an approach has worked well and has been fundamental to achieving, and sustaining, the important public-private standards partnership that has served the United States so well.

Federal government use of private sector standards was the subject of a recent review within the federal government, which resulted in recommendations endorsing a flexible approach, where the manner in which standards are made available is one, among many factors that an agency should consider and where agencies work cooperatively with SDOs to ensure reasonable availability of adopted standards consistent with the needs of the SDO. See the October 2011 memorandum entitled, “Federal Engagement in Standards Activities to Address National Priorities” by the National Science and Technology Council’s Technology Subcommittee on Standards (copy enclosed).
Requiring an agency to only reference standards that can be made available for free represents a significant deviation from the long-standing public-private partnership that has proven so effective in providing high quality private sector standards for government use. Therefore, we urge you to repeal Section 24 of HR 2845, or craft legislation to address the unprecedented shift in standards policy which it creates, in order to ensure regulatory solutions are in our shared interest in improving safety and health and protecting the environment.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. If you have any questions, please contact June Ling, Associate Executive Director, ASME Standards and Certification at lingj@asme.org or at 212-591-8570. We would be pleased to meet with you or your staff to discuss this issue in more detail.

Sincerely,

Thomas G. Loughlin
Executive Director
ASME

Patrick J. Natale, P.E.
Executive Director
American Society of Civil Engineers

Jeff Littleton
Executive Vice President
ASHRAE

James A. Thomas
President
ASTM International

Michael Tiller
President and CEO
Compressed Gas Association

Oliver Moghissi
Director of Materials and Corrosion Technology
NACE International

David A. Douin
Executive Director
The National Board of Boiler and Pressure Vessel Inspectors

James M. Shannon
President and CEO
National Fire Protection Association

David L. Schutt, PhD
Chief Executive Officer
SAE International

Cc: Members of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation (CST) Committee
January 17, 2012

The Honorable John L. Mica
Chairman
House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee
2165 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Nick J. Rahall, II
Ranking Member
House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee
2163 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable William Shuster
Chairman
Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials
B-376 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

The Honorable Corrine Brown
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials
592 Ford House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Chairs Mica and Shuster and Ranking Members Rahall and Brown:

As you know, Congress recently passed H.R. 2845, the “Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011” (“Pipeline Bill”), partly in response to the September 9, 2010 San Bruno pipeline explosion. The undersigned organizations write to express our strong concern that Section 24 of H.R. 2845 could adversely impact public safety, contrary to the intent of Congress, by placing practical barriers on the Department of Transportation’s ability to rely on the state of the art technical standards written by standards developing organizations (SDOs). Further, it would set a precedent that severely undermines the financial ability of SDOs to develop and make their standards available for government use.

As not-for-profit organizations, we have long supported the relationship between the public and private sectors through our continued development of voluntary consensus standards. These standards reduce the costs of goods and services; enhance safety, health, and quality of life; and facilitate innovation, trade, and competitiveness. Private-sector SDOs also substantially reduce the costs of government by providing a consistent and technically sound basis for regulation. Moreover, many SDOs underwrite the considerable cost of standards development and maintenance activities largely through the publication and sale of their standards on a reasonable basis.

Section 24 of H.R. 2845 prohibits the reference of any standard in a guidance document or regulation promulgated under the Pipeline Bill “unless the documents or portions thereof are
made available free of charge on an Internet Website.” This provision represents a radical departure from the long established federal policy, and practice, of promoting the federal government use of private sector standards; in operation it provides a not-for-profit SDO with the dilemma of either (1) nullifying the value of its intellectual property or (2) limiting the public safety impact of the standard by prohibiting its reference in the Department’s regulations. Either way, the SDO is impeded from accomplishing its charitable safety mission, and the public interest in effective safety regulation is thwarted.

Existing policy regarding the use of private sector standards in regulation has been established by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-119 (copy enclosed), which is a partial codification of the provisions contained within the “National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act” (P.L. 104-113). This policy aims to:

- eliminate the cost to the Government of developing its own standards and decrease the cost of goods procured and the burden of complying with agency regulation;
- provide incentives and opportunities to establish standards that serve national needs;
- encourage long-term growth for U.S. enterprises and promote efficiency and economic competition through harmonization of standards; and
- further the policy of reliance upon the private sector to supply Government needs for goods and services.

Recognizing the importance of copyright as a funding mechanism for the development of standards, the OMB Circular directs federal agencies to observe and protect the SDO’s copyrights, and agencies have done so successfully for decades. Section 24 of the Pipeline Bill will jeopardize the Department of Transportation’s ability to fulfill the important goals served by the OMB Circular. Further, if SDOs are unable, due to the financial impact of Section 24, to make their standards available for DOT adoption, it may result in:

- duplicative and potentially conflicting regulations and industry practices;
- reduced responsiveness, resulting in gaps and barriers to technology commercialization; and
- reduced stakeholder diversity in standards development.

SDOs have and will remain committed to providing wide and reasonable availability of their standards and to working with federal agencies to provide both pre- and post-adoption access to standards through a variety of means, appropriate to the many circumstances in which standards are adopted and used. But, in order to sustain funding for the development of private sector standards and to allow federal agencies to choose those standards that best meet the needs of public safety, a flexible approach is required. Such an approach has worked well and has been fundamental to achieving and sustaining the important public-private standards partnership that has served the United States so well.

Federal government use of private sector standards was the subject of a recent review within the federal government, which resulted in recommendations endorsing a flexible approach, where the manner in which standards are made available is one, among many factors that an agency should consider and where agencies work cooperatively with SDOs to ensure reasonable availability of adopted standards consistent with the needs of the SDO. See the October 2011 memorandum entitled, “Federal Engagement in Standards Activities to Address National
Priorities” by the National Science and Technology Council’s Technology Subcommittee on Standards (copy enclosed).

Requiring an agency to only reference standards that can be made available for free represents a significant deviation from the long-standing public-private partnership that has proven so effective in providing high quality private sector standards for government use. Therefore, we urge you to repeal Section 24 of HR 2845, or craft legislation to address the unprecedented shift in standards policy which it creates, in order to ensure regulatory solutions are in our shared interest in improving safety and health and protecting the environment.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. If you have any questions, please contact June Ling, ASME Associate Executive Director, Standards and Certification at lingj@asme.org or at 212-591-8570. We would be pleased to meet with you or your staff to discuss this issue in more detail.

Sincerely,

Thomas G. Loughlin
Executive Director
ASME

Patrick J. Natale, P.E.
Executive Director
American Society of Civil Engineers

Jeff Littleton
Executive Vice President
ASHRAE

James A. Thomas
President
ASTM International

Michael Tiller
President and CEO
Compressed Gas Association

Oliver Moghissi
Director of Materials and Corrosion Technology
NACE International

David A. Douin
Executive Director
The National Board of Boiler and Pressure Vessel Inspectors

James M. Shannon
President and CEO
National Fire Protection Association

David L. Schutt, PhD
Chief Executive Officer
SAE International

Cc: Members of the House Transportation and Infrastructure (T&I) Committee
    Members of the House Science, Space, and Technology (SST) Committee
    Members of the House Energy and Commerce (E&C) Committee
January 17, 2012

The Honorable Raymond H. LaHood
U.S. Department of Transportation
West Building, 9th Floor
1200 New Jersey Ave., SE
Washington, DC 20590

Dear Secretary LaHood:

As you know, Congress recently passed H.R. 2845, the “Pipeline Safety, Regulatory Certainty, and Job Creation Act of 2011” (“Pipeline Bill”), partly in response to the September 9, 2010 San Bruno pipeline explosion. Unfortunately, the Senate acted on this bill before stakeholders were able to engage with them on the issue of standards incorporated by reference into regulation. The undersigned organizations write to express our strong concern that Section 24 of H.R. 2845 could adversely impact public safety, contrary to the intent of Congress, by placing practical barriers on the Department of Transportation’s ability to rely on the state of the art technical standards written by standards developing organizations (SDOs). Further, it would set a precedent that severely undermines the financial ability of SDOs to develop and make their standards available for government use.

As not-for-profit organizations, we have long supported the relationship between the public and private sectors through our continued development of voluntary consensus standards. These standards reduce the costs of goods and services; enhance safety, health, and quality of life; and facilitate innovation, trade, and competitiveness. Private-sector SDOs also substantially reduce the costs of government by providing a consistent and technically sound basis for regulation. Moreover, many SDOs underwrite the considerable cost of standards development and maintenance activities largely through the publication and sale of their standards on a reasonable basis.

Section 24 of H.R. 2845 prohibits the reference of any standard in a guidance document or regulation promulgated under the Pipeline Bill “unless the documents or portions thereof are made available free of charge on an Internet Website.” This provision represents a radical departure from the long established federal policy, and practice, of promoting the federal government use of private sector standards; in operation it provides a not-for-profit SDO with the dilemma of either (1) nullifying the value of its intellectual property or (2) limiting the public safety impact of the standard by prohibiting its reference in the Department’s regulations. Either
way, the SDO is impeded from accomplishing its charitable safety mission, and the public interest in effective safety regulation is thwarted.

Existing policy dealing with the use of private sector standards in regulation has been established by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-119 (copy enclosed), which is a partial codification of the provisions contained within the “National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act” (P.L. 104-113). This policy aims to:

- eliminate the cost to the Government of developing its own standards and decrease the cost of goods procured and the burden of complying with agency regulation;
- provide incentives and opportunities to establish standards that serve national needs;
- encourage long-term growth for U.S. enterprises and promote efficiency and economic competition through harmonization of standards; and
- further the policy of reliance upon the private sector to supply Government needs for goods and services.

Recognizing the importance of copyright as a funding mechanism for the development of standards, the OMB Circular directs federal agencies to observe and protect the SDO’s copyrights, and agencies have done so successfully for decades. Section 24 of the Pipeline Bill will jeopardize the Department of Transportation’s ability to fulfill the important goals served by the OMB Circular. Further, if SDOs are unable, due to the financial impact of Section 24, to make their standards available for DOT adoption, it may result in:

- duplicative and potentially conflicting regulations and industry practices;
- reduced responsiveness, resulting in gaps and barriers to technology commercialization; and
- reduced stakeholder diversity in standards development.

SDOs have and will remain committed to providing wide and reasonable availability of their standards and to working with federal agencies to provide both pre- and post- adoption access to standards through a variety of means, appropriate to the many circumstances in which standards are adopted and used. But, in order to sustain funding for the development of private sector standards and to allow federal agencies to choose those standards that best meet the needs of public safety, a flexible approach is required. Such an approach has worked well and has been fundamental to achieving and sustaining the important public-private standards partnership that has served the United States so well.

Federal government use of private sector standards was the subject of a recent review within the federal government, which resulted in recommendations endorsing a flexible approach, where the manner in which standards are made available is one, among many factors that an agency should consider and where agencies work cooperatively with SDOs to ensure reasonable availability of adopted standards consistent with the needs of the SDO. See the October 2011 memorandum entitled, “Federal Engagement in Standards Activities to Address National Priorities” by the National Science and Technology Council’s Technology Subcommittee on Standards (copy enclosed).
Requiring an agency to only reference standards that can be made available for free represents a significant deviation from the long-standing public-private partnership that has proven so effective in providing high quality private sector standards for government use.

Therefore, prior to undertaking any rulemaking under the auspices of this legislation, we urge you or your designee(s) to meet with private sector SDOs to understand the unintended consequences of this provision and to ensure regulatory solutions are in our shared interest in improving safety and health and protecting the environment.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. If you have any questions, please contact June Ling, Associate Executive Director, ASME Standards and Certification at lingj@asme.org or at 212-591-8570. We would be pleased to meet with you or your staff to discuss this issue in more detail.

Sincerely,

Thomas G. Loughlin
Executive Director
ASME

Joe Bhatia
President and CEO
American National Standards Institute

Patrick J. Natale, P.E.
Executive Director
American Society of Civil Engineers

Jeff Littleton
Executive Vice President
ASHRAE

James A. Thomas
President
ASTM International

Michael Tiller
President and CEO
Compressed Gas Association

Oliver Moghissi
Director of Materials and Corrosion Technology
NACE International

David A. Douin
Executive Director
The National Board of Boiler and Pressure Vessel Inspectors

James M. Shannon
President and CEO
National Fire Protection Association

David L. Schutt, PhD
Chief Executive Officer
SAE International

Cc: Robert S. Rivkin, General Counsel
    Neil R. Eisner, Assistant General Counsel, Regulation and Enforcement
    Cynthia L. Quarterman, Administrator, Pipeline Safety and Hazardous Materials Administration (PHMSA)
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A brief update on the Student and Early Career Engineer taskforce progress to date in forming a new Sector. It will cover the proposed new Sector mission and vision statements, strategic goals and the proposed organizational structure to support new Sector work and strategic goals execution.
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none

Attachments: Power Point Presentation
Student & Early Career Development

Update to BOG on Proposed Sector Formation

February 16, 2012

Cindy Stong

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  
      - Committee on Student Design  
      - Committee on HPVC

  **Knowledge & Communities**
  - Global Communities Operating Board  
  - Student Sections Committee  
  - Programs & Activities Operating Board  
  - Affinity Groups Operating Board  
    - International Outreach Affinity Group

- **External stakeholders (see appendix for more information)**
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
  - 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

Roll out and stakeholder communication plan

- 2011 November 12-15: Initiated conversation with the Stakeholders on the New Sector strategic goals and collected their feedback

- 2012 March 1-16: Communicate to Stakeholders BOG decision and the next steps (via webinars & LTC discussion)

- 2012 June: Communicate with key stakeholders; new Sector meets

- 2012 July: Implement new Sector Structure; Support Leadership Transition

- 2012 February 16: Update BOG on a progress in creating Student & Early Career Development Sector

- 2012 March: Update COFI on the Budget Implications for the new Sector contingent on BOG decision in Apr

- 2012 April: Present to BOG a proposal and introduce a motion to vote on Student & Early Career Development Sector

- 2012 June: BOG vote on bylaws
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!

Appendix
External Stakeholders and Market Research Data

1. SPDC Futures 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
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Presented by: Tom Libertiny
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A brief update on the Knowledge and Community Sector’s Re-Alignment plans.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)
none

Attachments: PowerPoint Slides
Knowledge & Community Sector
Redesign Update
Board of Governors

ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Redesign Update
Current K&C Board and Taskforce Members

Tom Libertiny—K&C Sr. VP
Richard Bunce—K&C VP, Global Communities
Philip Carpentier—K&C VP, Programs & Activities
Marianne Chan—K&C Chair, Rules & Governance
KC de la Garza—K&C VP, Affinity Communities
Dianela Dubac—Member, Student Section Committee
Luc Geraets—K&C VP Elect, Technical Communities
Mindy Grinnan—K&C VP, Technical Communities
Mike Ireland—Managing Director, Engineering Research and Technology Development
Joy Liu—ECLIPSE Intern to K&C Board
Jarad Oehring—K&C Chair, Communications
Karen Ohland—K&C VP, Financial Operations
Raj Manchanda—Director, Emerging Technologies
Elio Manes—Director, Leadership & Communities
Michael Michaud—Managing Director, Global Alliances, International Relations Office
Rick Marboe—K&C VP Elect, Programs & Activities
Stacey Swisher Harnetty—PAO Sr. VP
ASME Knowledge & Community (K&C)—Redesign Update

**Value to Society**

**Mission**
- Disseminating knowledge, research and development, and the opportunity to develop content and relationships for all of our members globally.

**Key factors**
- 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
  - Increase leadership opportunities—succession planning
  - Increase volunteer and staff bandwidth through the separation of strategic planning from operations and through the involvement of more volunteers
  - Leverage the strengths of volunteers and staff by utilizing their core competencies
  - Help ASME to achieve growth metrics for membership engagement and increased revenues

**Advantages and Challenges**

**Advantages**
1. Robust flexibility for growth
2. Aligned with Enterprise-wide growth areas
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
Next Steps for Board of Governors

- Propose organizational restructuring during March webinar (March 20)
- Follow-up presentation at April Board meeting
Date Submitted: January 26, 2012
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To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) Student and Early Career Engineer taskforce
Presented by: Julio Guerrero
Agenda Title: Leadership Task Force

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

A brief update on the Leadership Task Force’s progress to date in developing recommendations for training and identifying volunteer leaders for ASME.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)
none

Attachments: Power Point Presentation
ASME Leadership Task Force

Julio Guerrero, Chair

Presentation for
February 16, 2012
Board of Governors Meeting
Task Force Members

Chair
Julio Guerrero

Members
Harry Armen
Howard Berkof
Jennifer Jewers-Bowlin
Richard Laudenat
Justin Young
Jack Ware

Staff
David Soukup
RuthAnn Bigley

Four Top Recommendations

1. How we attract and keep key potential leaders.

2. Attracting and keeping renowned worldwide leaders to ASME.

3. Systematic development and training of leaders among ASME volunteers and staff.

4. Leadership development integrated into the ASME long-term strategy.
Action Plan

1. Reviewed extensive work done at ASME on leadership.

2. Monthly Meetings and email discussions.

3. Share recommendations on draft to be sent to Board before February 24. Comments received by March 9 will be incorporated into final report for BOG meeting in April 2012.

ASME Leadership Task Force

Thank you.
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To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other)
Presented by: Vickie Rockwell
Agenda Title: EWeek Update and Highlights

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

Vickie Rockwell will present a five minute overview of key activities, highlights and updates related to ASME’s leadership in EWeek 2012.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Attachments: Power Point presentation
ENGINEERS WEEK 2012

EWeek.org
www.ASME.org/events/engineers-week-2012

EWeek 2012

• DiscoverE Educators Awards
• DiscoverE Summit
• Inspire Innovation Workshops
EWeek PROGRAMS

- DiscoverE
- Future City Competition NEW
  + Essays on Fuel Your Future
- Introduce A Girl to Engineering
- Family Day Events
- Sightseer’s Guide to Engineering
- New Faces of Engineering NEW
  + College Edition!

MORE

2012 GLOBAL MARATHON FOR, BY AND ABOUT WOMEN IN ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY

Contact: engineeringwomen@eweek.org
EWeek 2012 — Educator Recognition Awards

• DiscoverE Educator Awards
• To highlight and celebrate exceptional STEM educators and their practices — “unsung heroes”
• Time Line:
  — Nominations: 184
  — Winners notified: Jan 10
  — Recognition: Feb 22

EWeek 2012 — DiscoverE Summit

• Wednesday, Feb 22, Newseum
• Moderator:
  Miles O’Brien, PBS Newshour
• Keynotes:
  Charles Vest, NAE
  Subra Suresh, Ph.D., Director, NSF
• Panelists:
  UC-Davis, NASA, Sesame Workshop, Discover, National GEM Consortium, Teachers
EWeek 2012 —
Inspire Innovation Workshops

- Grassroots
- Enables groups to host workshops for K-12 STEM educators to build their repertoire of hands-on engineering activities and provide networking opportunities for teachers and engineers locally
- Idaho Falls (Oct 6-7)
- Denver (Nov 12)
- Houston (Jan 21)

— guides available online —

Resources

www.asme.org/events/engineers-week-2012
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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 Action Register

Finance & Reporting Activity
The Uniform Reporting Task Force is chaired by Madiha Kotb. The task force has representation from each sector, with staff support provided by David Webber. A timeline has been established. The plan is to have recommendations for the March COFI/SMC meeting.

Aging Infrastructure Assessment/ASME Complex Systems Failure
Areas of proposed activity include scoping out significant issues across sectors/nations; four case studies to cut across sectors and a workshop to build stakeholder interest. Two sessions are planned at the 2012 PVP conference. An Initiative Fund request of $190,000 is being developed by CRTD.

Disaster Recovery
Public Affairs & Outreach and Standards & Certification have developed draft guidelines which were reviewed by the SMC at the January teleconference. Marc Goldsmith will review the proposed guidelines with the Presidential Team. The SMC has recommended that the draft guidelines be an appendix to the SMC Operation Guide.

SMC Retreat
The SMC retreat is scheduled for February 9&10 in Naples Florida.

II. Sector Updates

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

- The Board on Nuclear C&S (BNCS) Task Force on Design Basis and Response to Severe Accidents has established a sub-task force. The purpose is to provide individual expert comments on the Japan Society of Mechanical Engineers’ (JSME) draft JSME Guideline for Management of Severe Accident Due to External Events. Individual comments have been provided to JSME. They were advised that these comments do not infer any approval by ASME or any of its standards bodies. JSME provided responses to these comments during the November, 2011 Boiler Code Week.
  At the request of JSME, the BNCS TF leads, Bryan Erler and Chris Sanna will attend a special meeting at JSME Headquarters on January 24 to discuss the status of JSME’s proposed Severe Accident Guideline, Structural Design Code under Severe Accident Condition, and a proposal for a New Comprehensive Plan for C&S Development.

- ASME and the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) have agreed on a framework for cooperative efforts between the two organizations in the area of standards for energy assessment for pumping systems. This would result in the first-ever joint ISO/ASME Standard. The agreement calls for the establishment of a Joint Working Group comprised of subject matter experts from ISO/TC 115 and the ASME Industrial System Energy Assessment Standards Committee. They would develop an initial draft standard, based upon the existing ASME Standard EA-2 – Energy Assessment for Pumping Systems. The proposed standard would be submitted for approval in a parallel process within the responsible ISO and ASME Committees. The agreement was signed by the Secretary-General, ISO and the Associate Executive Director, Standards and Certification, ASME.

- Through the first 6 months of FY 12, the number of international members participating on Standards and Certification committees increased by 82 (13.6 %) for a total of 684 international members. This represents 14% of the total S&C Committee membership. The main driver for this increase was the establishment of the

ASME will be the essential resource for mechanical engineers and other technical professionals throughout the world for solutions that benefit humankind.
membership for the China International Working Group and the Korea International Working Group for Boiler and Pressure Vessel Committee III, Nuclear Facility Components. International Working Groups facilitate participation by allowing technical experts to discuss ASME standards issues in their own country and language.

- A new Division 5, High Temperature Reactors, of the Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Section III, Construction of Nuclear Facility Components, was published. Div. 5 establishes construction requirements for components and structures used in high temperature gas-cooled reactors and liquid metal reactors, and also includes rules for graphite core support structures which represents a new technology in Section III.
- The Oil Industry Safety Directorate of India (OISD) issued an update of their standard for Design, Construction, and Inspection Requirements for Cross Country Liquid Petroleum Pipelines. It references a number of ASME standards, including some B16, B18, and B31 Standards, as well as PCC-2 and Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code Sections VIII-Div.1, and IX
- Two new ASME certification programs have been initiated. The Bioprocessing Equipment Certification Program is available to manufacturers and suppliers of fittings and tubing falling under the scope of the ASME BPE Standard for Bioprocessing Equipment. The NQA-1 Certification Program is available for quality assurance programs which meet the requirements of the ASME NQA-1 Standard, 2008 edition or later. The program recognizes a supplier’s quality assurance program for items or services which perform a safety function – the performance of an item or service necessary to achieve safe, reliable, and effective utilization of nuclear energy and nuclear material processing.

Institutes – Dilip Ballal, Michael Ireland

- The Petroleum Division of the IPTI provided $1.25 million from their custodial funds to endow an ASME Chair Professorship in Petroleum Technology at the University of Houston, Texas.
- 2013 ASME (India) Pipeline Conference selected Jaipur or Hyderabad for their February meeting. Contract negotiations are in progress.
- Operations Director for IGTI: Charity Prentice appointed effective 1 March 2012.
- The IGTI Board voted to double student scholarships to $40K. These are international scholarships and this amount will appear in our 2013 budget request for COFI. Also, ASME (India) Gas Turbine Chapter petitions were signed by over 40 attendees. Plans are in works to hold a gas turbine symposium in India in 2012. Finally, Air Movement and Control Association (AMCA) will co-locate their annual conference with ASME Turbo Expo in 2013.

Public Affairs & Outreach – Stacey Swisher Harnetty, Phil Hamilton

- EGD/E4C:
  - Development of the EGD 3 year plan is currently underway.
  - As of FY12 Q2, E4C has received $296,250 in external funding this fiscal year including $25,000 ASCE, $2,500 OSA, $150,000 UEF, $50,000 IEEE Foundation, $25,000 SWE, $43,750 IEEE contributions.
- Public Information:
  - Continued ramp-up for EWeek 2012; more than 180 nominations submitted for inaugural DiscoverE Educator Awards; DiscoverE Summit panelists and speakers confirmed; Inspire Innovation workshop held in Denver and another on January 21.
  - Collaborated with Marketing and ASME Foundation for new brochures and collateral materials for ASME Foundation.
- Government Relations:
  - ASME is accepting applications through March 31st for participation in its Federal Government Fellowship Program. This year, ASME will be placing a Federal Fellow with the USAID (United States Agency for International Development), the principal federal agency to extend assistance to countries recovering from disaster, trying to escape poverty, and engaging in democratic reforms.
  - Government Relations will convene their annual “Inter-Sector Committee for Federal Research and Development (ISCFRD)” Budget Review, on Monday, March 5, 2012 on Capitol Hill in Washington, DC.

*ASME will be the essential resource for mechanical engineers and other technical professionals throughout the world for solutions that benefit humankind.*
Approximately 25 ASME Members from Knowledge & Community will be joining us for briefings by officials from the Administration, congressional staff, and key science and engineering agencies (NSF, NIST, NASA, DOD, DOE, NIH and EPA) on the Fiscal Year 2013 Research and Development budget request and how it will impact the engineering community.

- ASME will once again be the lead organizer of the annual “Engineering Public Policy Symposium,” which is scheduled for Tuesday, April 17, 2012 in Washington, DC. Society leaders from approximately 33 engineering organizations will be invited to cosponsor and attend this multi-disciplinary public policy event. The event is funded by a grant obtained by ASME Government Relations from the United Engineering Foundation.
- ASME’s General Position Paper on “Mandatory Educational Requirements for Engineering Licensure”, which was issued in April 2008, has been updated by ASME and the ASME-led “Licensing that Works Coalition” and will be provided to the Board of Governors for approval at their February Board meeting. The position statement is available to view at http://www.asme.org/about-asme/advocacy-government-relations/position-statements.

- Industry Advisory Board:
The IAB will be holding a webinar on January 24th to receive an update on recommendations from their March 2011 meeting held in conjunction with ASME’s Engineering Education Conference as well as the statues of the Vision 2030 project. Vice President of Education Bill Wepfer will lead the conversation. Additionally the Board plans to meet and April 16-17 in Washington, DC in conjunction with the Engineering Public Policy Symposium.

- Education:
An ASME Board on Education Inspire Innovation Workshop for teachers was held January 21 at the Houston Museum of Science. 55 teachers and 15 engineer volunteers attended. The next workshop is scheduled for March 10, Clearwater Beach, FL, co-located with the 2012 ME Education Conference.

Knowledge & Community – Tom Libertiny, Michael Ireland

- Weekly task force meetings have been held on restructuring to provide networking and technology transfer engagement opportunities.
- Energy Indicators Steering Committee held a wrap up call and made recommendations for next steps to E-SET.
- Work continues in collaboration with VOLT on LTC 2012.
- Audit reviews of affected K&C Conferences has been completed. Work continues on approving conferences through the Events Committee and the utilization of our EPAT tool.
- K&C continues weekly teleconferences with the PAO sector toward building the new Student/Early Career Sector.
- K&C participated with the PAO sector at a retreat to develop the new student/early career organization structure.
- K&C strategy taskforce is holding a retreat to develop the new Global, Affinity, and K&C organizations. The Strategic Planning Committee’s Integrated/Sustainable Building Equipment and Systems Task Force met for the first time on January 5, 2012 via teleconference. Nearly 30 interested global professionals participated.
- Emerging Technologies (ET) partnering with ASME Standards Technology LLC entered into a contract with Energy-Water Nexus Interdisciplinary Council’s executive committee member, Carey King, Ph.D. The purpose is to develop a design guidance document for Power Plant Cooling Systems, with an expected date of completion is Congress 2013.
- The New Product Development (NPD) funding process was launched with seed funding for multidisciplinary activities/products in Technical Communities.
- The Energy-Water Nexus Congress 2011 Report and Energy for Water Provision webinar was successfully offered on December 6, 2011 with 100+ participants.
- The last two online courses of the Nano Educational Series were launched in December 2011: Fundamentals of Nanomanufacturing and Applications and Fundamentals of Nanometrology.

ASME will be the essential resource for mechanical engineers and other technical professionals throughout the world for solutions that benefit humankind.
III. VOLT Academy – Progress report submitted by Bill Cousins

Activities

- Officer Training
  - On November 13, 2011, VOLT sponsored the Diversity Forum which was attended by 33 volunteer officers and other top leaders within the Society. The ASME President Vickie Rockwell was on hand to open the event. The overall rating for the forum using a 4.0 scale was 3.86.
  - The VOLT Academy held the Officer-elect Orientation on November 11, 2011. During this orientation Society officers were given information and tools to help them better navigate their new positions as leaders within the organization. The overall rating received for this orientation was 3.12 on a 4.0 scale.
- During Congress, past and present ASME interns, including members of the Early Career Leadership Intern Program to Serve Engineering (ECLIPSE) and Leadership Development Intern (LDI) programs, were invited to attend a reception held in conjunction with the Early Career Engineers on Sunday, November 13, 2011. This was a successful event, which allowed ECLIPSE and LDI interns to network with Early Career Engineers. Special attendees included three former LDI interns from the inaugural class, two of which are also part of VOLT’s committees.
- The ECLIPSE Intern program committee is now in the process of collecting applications for the 2012-2013 class. The accepted applicants will attend special events at LTC as the unofficial kickoff to the program. At this time, we have received three applications for the program. The deadline for all applications was January 19, 2012.
- The next Nominating Committee training by the VOLT Academy will take place on Wednesday, April 11, 2012. Past topics covered during this training included Confidentiality, Responsibilities of an Officer, Ethics, and the Balanced Score Card.
- The VOLT Academy sponsored a leadership workshop for volunteer leaders entitled “Value-Based Leadership” by Ron Crossland on November 13, 2011. The workshop received an overall attendee rating of 3.82 on a 4.0 scale. The workshop was attended by 34 volunteers, including five members of the Board of Governors (BOG), two BOG-elects, one Vice President, one Vice President-elect and three ECLIPSE Interns.
- The plans for the 2012 Leadership Training Conference are continuing as the conference dates are March 1 – 4, 2012. The VOLT Leadership Workshop entitled “Innovation at the Verge” is scheduled to take place on Thursday afternoon before the conference and will be facilitated by Joel Barker, a noted futurist. Currently, all slots (85) for this workshop have been filled.

At this time, there are 232 people registered for LTC. The registration includes the following groups:

9 Districts
19 Technical Communities
10 Members from Public Affairs and Outreach
4 Affinity Groups
58 Sections

This year, the delegate registration process began earlier than the previous year, which has helped to increase the registered number of attendees over last year. However, the co-staff leads and volunteers are still working on identifying and registering as many delegates as possible. Many thanks go to Ty Booker, Marian Heller, the rest of the staff and the LTC Committee for their continuing efforts to make LTC 2012 a success.

Future Activities

- VOLT is in the process of planning the BOG and Presidential candidates’ briefings in April and May.
- VOLT will be working with the Presidential Team and Senior Vice Presidents to create this presentation for the Nominating Committee. This event will take place in May.
IV. Events Committee (EC) – Progress report submitted by Jim Coaker

- The Events Committee (EC) continues to meet via teleconference on approximately 3 -- 4 week intervals as event review activity continues to increase.
- We have reviewed and approved 14 events to date; none have yet been formally declined, although in one case we corresponded with event leadership to offer suggestions for current and future planning, and in another the use of ASME logo is at issue. Requests for information from both staff and volunteer communities continue to receive prompt response.
- Early reviews have surfaced several administrative areas which warrant attention. Phyllis Klasky and her staff have been and continue to be resourceful in liaison and in researching options, providing guidance and pursuing issues. These include:
  - Indemnification issues for events in which ASME is a ‘passive’ participant … ferreting out just what ASME’s liability may be when “Only the logo is used.” This has been discussed with chair of SMC; EC requests policy be developed in greater detail to create a level playing field and establish rules of engagement common to all entities.
  - Addressing budget revisions following initial event approval, both for ASME managed events and those managed by others. Situations have occurred where budget data in the Event Planning Approval Tool (EPAT) has been updated, apparently without a track record of change. Comments entered in EPAT by EC members may no longer be applicable (or even coherent) based on data revisions, but absent a tracking mechanism results in a disconnect.
  - Recommending / implementing administrative changes to EPAT system to be more consistent with EC function / needs
- As the EC develops experience, there are several challenges in focus and on the horizon which the Committee is currently addressing:
  - Short lead time events that “Only wish to use the ASME logo,” but for which there is insufficient information on which to base an informed decision.
  - Absence of financial data from prior events (for background). We understand EPAT is a “new” system *per se*, but somewhere such data exists. Overall, EC has had reasonable response to requests for historical financial information.
  - One division has surfaced strong indications of operating autonomously and independently, separate from ASME Events Management or ASME involvement. History dates back to similar issues with the Conference Planning Committee (CPC) but it is too early to tell how this will develop with the EC. The Committee takes its charter to adhere to Policy 12.1 to heart, and will make every effort to execute due diligence in the process.
  - Several events have been proposed based on MOUs executed prior to the advent of P12.1. The EC has deferred to terms of these MOUs, but will advise event planners that future activity is expected to be within the parameters established by P12.1 (or waiver with substantiation must be requested / approved).
- Other observations:
  - Former chair of CPC is a member of EC; this has provided liaison for significant background information, understanding of prior challenges and effect transition from CPC to EC venue.
  - Liaison individual from Task Force participating in teleconferences and “on call” continues to provide effective information bridge and a welcome resource for sector liaison.
  - In doing reviews, EC has surfaced several finance related questions concerning custodial funds, authorization of who can sign what, and other assets (p.e. operational funds – ref P2.1) held by sub sets of the organization. While these aspects are not the primary purview of EC, we relay questions and issues to staff / volunteers as appropriate on a case basis.
  - Prior to establishment of the EC, we understand several “activities” were run and financially backed by “Operational funds” vs. custodial funds. P12.1 IA addresses only events backed by custodial funds. Question: does this create a separate system beyond EPAT for “activities” backed by operational funds (which are allowed -- with limitations -- via P 2.1)? Should P12.1 be amended to include both?
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Agenda Item
Cover Memo

Date Submitted: January 10, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: February 16, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: 2012 Nominating Committee
Presented by: Victoria Blocker, Chair Nominating Committee
Agenda Title: Endorsement of a Single Candidate
(Single Proposed Nominee for Vice President)

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

The Board of Governors passed the motion below at its April 14, 2011 meeting.

To endorse, in principle as discussed on April 14, 2011, the option for Sector/Council Boards to be able to submit one candidate to the Nominating Committee on a case by case basis, as acceptable to the Nominating Committee, and to proceed, in cooperation with Nominating Committee, to develop procedures to be included in the MM-10 Nominating Committee Manual.

The Nominating Committee has fulfilled this request by developing procedures to address a Single Candidate in its 2012 Nominating Committee Manual, Part One, and Section 8.2.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate) None

Attachments: One
Date: October 25, 2011
To: The Board of Governors
From: 2012 Nominating Committee
Subject: Endorsement of a Single Candidate
(Single Proposed Nominee for Vice President)

As requested, The 2012 Nominating Committee has developed procedures in its MM-10 Nominating Committee Manual regarding the Endorsement of a Single Candidate. In our manual it is referred to as a Single Proposed Nominee for Vice President.

However, the 2012 Nominating Committee would like to state its preference for more than one candidate.
Date Submitted: January 10, 2012  
BOG Meeting Date: February 16, 2012

To: Board of Governors  
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) asme.org Task Force  
Presented by: Said Jahanmir  
Agenda Title: ASME.ORG TF Report to BOG

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

The attached power point presentation briefly summarizes the current focus of the asme.org Advisory Task Force. The TF has been meeting by teleconference on a monthly basis to review the status of the project and discuss the present and future metrics. At these meetings, we review the status reports prepared by HUGE and the Web Analytics report produced by the ASME.org staff team and add our assessment. We have sent monthly reports to the Presidential Team, ED, and Chair of COFI.

Data is currently being gathered on site traffic, pages visited, time spent, etc. These data are very encouraging and positive. However, in the long-term, we need to go beyond such measures and develop a set of metrics to measure our progress towards ASME’s mission, strategic initiatives, and revenue and membership goals. The TF will continue its discussions on types of data that need to be gathered in future and the needed metrics.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)
Consent item for receipt

Attachments: Power Point Presentation
Advisory Task Force Update
ASME.org Project

Howard Berkof, Past Chair, Management Division
Warren DeVries, Member of COFI
Said Johanmir, Chair and BDG Representative
Julie Bachmann Kulik, BOG ECLIPSE Intern 2009-2010
Michael Merker, ASME Staff
Sharon Miller, ASME Staff
Susan O’Neill, External Consultant
Reginald Vachon, Advisor to Task Force and Chair of COFI

For the BOG
January 2012

Focus on Measurement and Metrics

Current Focus: Metrics Dashboard to measure effectiveness of Phase 1 of the web strategy.

Key metrics are:
- Overall Site Traffic
- User Engagement
- Content Engagement
- Global Activities
Focus on Measurement and Metrics (cont.)

Longer term: Strategic Metrics Framework linking web site effectiveness with ASME’s business strategy and goals.

In particular:

- ASME Mission and Vision
- ASME Strategic Initiatives
- ASME Revenue and Membership Goals

Phase 2/3 Project Monitoring

- Monthly Conference calls to review project status
- Project updates provided by vendor
- TF report including analysis of status and any issues needing attention are sent to the Presidential Team
Phases 2/3 -- Current Focus Area

Provide new and different ways for users to engage – digitally!!

Currently planning key components of the Community offerings
ASME Board of Governors
Agenda Item
Cover Memo

Date Submitted: January 26, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: February 16, 2012

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

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

Proposed appointments reviewed by the COR on January 23, 2012

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

Approve the proposed appointments.

Attachments: Appointments listing.
### February 2012
**PROPOSED APPOINTMENTS TO ASME UNIT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Unit</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>Committee on Honors</td>
<td>Christina Amon</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>7/2012 to 6/2015</td>
<td>7/2009 to 6/2012</td>
<td>Current Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Honors</td>
<td>Arthur Bergles</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>7/2012 to 6/2015</td>
<td>7/2009 to 6/2012</td>
<td>Current Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Honors</td>
<td>Ronald Bunker</td>
<td>Member</td>
<td>7/2012 to 6/2015</td>
<td>N/A Succeeding</td>
<td>Westinghouse Medal Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Rosenberg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### February 2012
**PROPOSED APPOINTMENTS TO Outside Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Unit</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>U.S. National Committee on Theoretical and Applied Mechanics</td>
<td>Tayfun Tezduyar</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>10/2012 to 9/2016</td>
<td>Succeeding Stelios Kyriakides</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
At its meeting of November 15, 2011, the Committee on Honors voted to recommend to the Board of Governors the elevation of the Nemat-Nasser Early Career Award from a Divisional Award to a Society Level Award.

Proposed motion for BOG Action:

To accept the Committee on Honors recommendation to elevate Nemat-Nasser Early Career Award from a Divisional Award to a Society Level Award.
Establishment of a New ASME Society Award
In accordance with ASME P-3.2 February 19, 2009

TO ASME Committee on Honors

FROM: Mohammed Zikry, Chair - ASME Materials Division Executive Committee

Name of the Award

The Nemat-Nasser Early Career Award (NNEC Award).

Submitted by the Materials Division of ASME in honor of Dr. Sia Nemat-Nasser, Director of the Center of Excellence for Advanced Materials at UC San Diego and Distinguished Professor of Mechanics and Materials. Dr. Nemat-Nasser is a Fellow and Honorary Member of ASME.

Statement of Attainment to be Recognized by the Award

This Early Career Medal Award is established and given by the Materials Division of ASME in honor of Dr. Sia-Nemat Nasser to recognize early career research excellence in the areas of experimental, computational, and theoretical mechanics and materials by young investigators who are within 10 years after their Ph.D. degree, with special emphasis placed on under-represented groups.

Description of the Award

Currently, the Nadai Medal is an ASME society award that recognizes an individual for their long-term service to the materials community. In the spirit of trying to encourage younger investigators to eventually achieve the Nadai Medal Award, the need for a young investigator award arose. Professor Nemat-Nasser has always encouraged young people to pursue math, science, and engineering related to Mechanical Engineering. The Nemat-Nasser Early Career Medal Award (NNEC) recipient will be awarded a medal, certificate, and honorarium of $5,000. In addition, travel expenses will be reimbursed, in accordance with ASME Policy -4.5, to allow the recipient to attend the meeting at which the presentation is made. The Medal is to be given to a single individual (and not shared between two or more). No individual should receive the Medal more than once.

Assurance of Minimum Funding Requirements

Funds to endow this award have been provided through an endowment of $130,000 to the ASME Foundation.
Eligibility and Selection Criteria:

Any researcher within 10 years of a terminal degree working in experimental, computational, or theoretical mechanics and materials can be considered for the Nemat-Nasser Early Career Medal Award. The Division will continue to make a special effort to identify promising researchers from among under-represented groups.

Nominations will come from members of the Materials Division Executive Committee, the editor of the Journal of Engineering Materials and Technology, the Chairs of the ASME Technical Committees or their designees, and the general membership. The nominator must name the proposed young investigator, briefly describe the importance of the work by the early-career investigator, and give the nominee's full contact information to the Nemat-Nasser Committee Awards Chair. The Chair of the Nemat-Nasser Awards Committee will present the nominations to the Materials Division Executive Committee for a final vote.

The Nemat-Nasser Awards Committee will comprise:

The past 3 Medalists,  
The current Materials Division Executive Committee Chair,  
The MD Honors and Awards Committee Chair,  
The MD Vice Chair,  
One MD Technical Committee Chair (with rotation based alphabetically by the name of the committee).

The current Executive Committee Chair will serve as chair.

Schedule:

The Chair of the Nemat-Nasser Awards Committee will solicit nominations no later than March 1. The Chair will present the nominations to the MD Executive Committee for discussion and final vote no later than April 1. Once the nominee is selected and approved by the Materials Division Executive Committee, the final nomination is then sent on to the ASME Committee on Honors and the Board of Governors for their action by April 1.

Send all nominations and inquiries to the Chair of the Nemat-Nasser Medal Awards Committee.

Presentation of the Award:

The Nemat-Nasser Early Career Award will be conferred at the Materials Division Awards ceremony at the annual ASME IMECE meeting in the calendar year following his/her selection. The Division will cover travel expenses and any expenses related with the Division’s reception or lunch.
To: Board of Governors  
From: Human Resources  
Presented by: Laurel Raso  
Agenda Title: Defined Contribution Pension/Thrift Plan Amendments  

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

The Board is being asked to adopt two minor required Plan Amendments for both Defined Contribution Pension Plan and the Thrift Savings Plan.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)  

Approve the Amendments to the ASME Defined Contribution Pension Plan and ASME Thrift Savings Plan  

Attachments:  
Narrative and Resolutions and Plan Amendments
Narrative and Resolutions of the
Board of Governors of The American Society of Mechanical Engineers

Amendments to the
American Society of Mechanical Engineers Thrift Savings Plan
and the
American Society of Mechanical Engineers Defined Contributions (DC) Pension Plan

February 16, 2012

Narrative

The Board of Governors (the “Board”) of The American Society of Mechanical Engineers (“ASME”) has determined that it would be beneficial to amend the American Society of Mechanical Engineers American Society of Mechanical Engineers Thrift Savings Plan (the "Thrift Plan") and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers DC Pension Plan (the “DC Plan”) (collectively, the “Plans”).

The proposed amendments to the Plans are generally required pursuant to applicable law and are intended to reflect certain provisions of, and governmental guidance related to, the Heroes Earnings and Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (“HEART”) and the Worker, Retiree and Employer Recovery Act of 2008 (“WRERA”). The Plans have generally been operated in accordance with HEART and WRERA, and formal documentation is now being proposed.

The proposed amendments pursuant to HEART pertain to changes in retirement plan rules for military personnel and their families. The proposed amendments provide, among other things, for differential pay (to the extent provided) to be treated as plan compensation and for participants on active military duty to be treated as having terminated employment for purposes of determining eligibility for distributions of certain contributions and related earnings, and prohibits participants who die or become disabled while performing qualified military service from accruing benefits under the plan related to the period of military service that they would have received if they had returned to work with the employer immediately before the actual date of death or disability.

The proposed amendments pursuant to WRERA pertain to relief from 2009 required minimum distributions (“RMDs”) and the operation of the Plans with respect thereto. As a means of alleviating some of the financial burdens on older Americans, Congress passed WRERA a few years ago, which, among other things, suspended RMDs for calendar year 2009 for defined contribution retirement plans. Normally, in order to prevent individuals from using retirement accounts as tax shelters, retirement plan participants must take at least an annual RMD from such plan beginning, generally, no later than the April 1 of the calendar year following the later of the year in which they reach age 70 1/2 or retire. RMDs are also normally required for beneficiaries of deceased participants.
**Resolutions**

WHEREAS, The American Society of Mechanical Engineers (“ASME”) maintains the American Society of Mechanical Engineers Thrift Savings Plan (the "Thrift Plan") and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers DC Pension Plan (the “DC Plan”) (collectively, the "Plans");

WHEREAS, it has been determined that it is desirable to amend the Plans pursuant to applicable law to reflect certain provisions of, and governmental guidance related to, the Heroes Earnings and Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (“HEART”) and the Worker, Retiree and Employer Recovery Act of 2008 (“WRERA”); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 7.06 of the basic plan document governing each Plan, ASME may amend the Plans;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT:

RESOLVED, that the Plans are hereby amended in the forms attached hereto as Exhibits A, B, C and D, generally effective as indicated therein; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the appropriate officers of ASME are hereby authorized to take such other actions, including the execution and approval of appropriate documents (including amendments to the Plans’ adoption agreements), the modification of such documents and the distribution of relevant disclosure documents to participants in the Plans, as they deem necessary and appropriate in light of the preceding preambles and resolutions.
Heroes Earnings and Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (HEART) Adoption Agreement Amendment

This amendment of the Plan (hereinafter referred to as "the Amendment") is comprised of this Heroes Earnings and Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (HEART) Adoption Agreement Amendment (the "Adoption Agreement Amendment") and the corresponding Basic Plan Document Amendment. The Amendment is adopted to reflect the provisions of the Heroes Earnings and Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (HEART). The Amendment is intended to provide good faith compliance with HEART and related guidance until the Plan is formally restated to incorporate such guidance. The Amendment is effective as specified in this Adoption Agreement Amendment except as otherwise provided in the Basic Plan Document Amendment. The Amendment supersedes the existing provisions of the Plan to the extent that those provisions are inconsistent with the provisions of the Amendment.

EMPLOYER INFORMATION

Name of Plan American Society of Mechanical Engineers Thrift Savings Plan
Plan Sequence Number 101 Account Number 103533

CONTRIBUTIONS

Part A. Benefit Accrual in the Case of Death or Disability Resulting from Qualified Military Service

Will the benefit accrual provisions under Code Section 414(u)(9) apply to individuals who are unable to be reemployed on account of death or Disability while performing qualified military service as defined in Code Section 414(u) (select one)?

Option 1: ☐ Yes, effective __________ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2007, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 2: ☑ No.

NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 2 will apply.

VESTING AND FORFEITURES

Part A. Vesting in the Case of Disability Resulting from Qualified Military Service

Will Years of Vesting Service be credited to individuals who are unable to be reemployed on account of Disability while performing qualified military service as defined in Code Section 414(u) (select one)?

Option 1: ☐ Yes, effective __________ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2007, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 2: ☑ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2007, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 3: ☑ Not applicable. Individuals become 100% Vested upon Disability under the terms of the Plan.

NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 2 will apply. Regardless of which option is selected, individuals who are unable to be reemployed on account of death while performing qualified military service must be credited with Years of Vesting Service.

DISTRIBUTIONS

Part A. Deemed Severance from Employment

May a Participant request a distribution of their Elective Deferrals and earnings on account of Deemed Severance from Employment while performing military service as defined in Code Section 3401(h)(2)(A) (select one)?

Option 1: ☑ Yes, effective __________ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2009, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 2: ☐ No.

NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 1 will apply.

DEFINITIONS

Part A. Differential Wage Payments

Unless a different definition of Compensation is required by either the Code or ERISA, will Differential Wage Payments be included in Compensation for contribution, allocation and other general Plan purposes (select one)?

Option 1: ☑ Yes, effective __________ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2009, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 2: ☐ No.

NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 1 will apply and the effective date will be the later of January 1, 2009, or the Effective Date of the Plan.
Signature of Employer

1. I acknowledge that I have relied upon my own advisers regarding the completion of the Amendment and the legal and tax implications of amending this Plan;
2. I understand that my failure to properly complete the Amendment may result in disqualification of the Plan; and
3. I have received a copy of the Amendment.

Signature of Adopting Employer ___________________________ Date Signed ______________
Type Name ___________________________ Title ___________________________
This amendment of the Plan (hereinafter referred to as "the Amendment") is comprised of this Worker, Retiree and Employer Recovery Act of 2008 (WRERA) Adoption Agreement Amendment (the "Adoption Agreement Amendment") and the corresponding Basic Plan Document Amendment. The Amendment is adopted to reflect the provisions of WRERA. The Amendment is intended to provide good faith compliance with WRERA and related guidance until the Plan is formally restated to incorporate such guidance. The Amendment is effective January 1, 2009, and such provisions apply to Plan operations during the period beginning on December 1, 2009, and ending on December 31, 2009. The IRS will not consider the Plan to have failed to operate in accordance with its terms merely because during the period beginning on January 1, 2009, and ending on November 30, 2009, the Plan's operation conflicted with the provisions of the Amendment pertaining to required minimum distributions (RMDs) for 2009. The Amendment supersedes the existing provisions of the Plan to the extent that those provisions are inconsistent with the provisions of the Amendment.

**EMPLOYER INFORMATION**

**Name of Plan**
American Society of Mechanical Engineers Thrift Savings Plan

**Plan Sequence Number**
101

**Account Number**
103533

**PARTS A THROUGH C**

### Part A. 2009 RMD Payment Election

May Participants and Beneficiaries who would have otherwise been required to receive RMDs for 2009 but for the enactment of Code Section 401(a)(9)(I-I) choose whether to remove their 2009 RMD or Extended 2009 RMD from the Plan (select one)?

**Option 1:** Yes. (Complete the following)

- Suboption (a): ☑ retain such amount within the Plan.
- Suboption (b): ❌ distribute such amount to the Participant or Beneficiary.

**NOTE:** If no suboption is selected, Suboption (a) will apply.

**Option 2:** No. (Complete the following)

- Suboption (a): ❌ retain such amount within the Plan.
- Suboption (b): ☑ distribute such amount to the Participant or Beneficiary.

**NOTE:** If no option is selected, Option 1 will apply. If Option 2, Suboption (a) is selected, ERISA Section 204(g) may be violated if no other distribution event is available to a Participant or Beneficiary under the Plan. Generally, ERISA Section 204(g) prohibits the elimination of protected benefits and protected benefits include the timing of payout options. Refer to ERISA Section 204(g) and the corresponding Treasury regulation for details pertaining to the elimination of an otherwise protected benefit.

### Part B. Annuity Starting Dates

If a 2009 RMD or Extended 2009 RMD is not removed from the Plan, there will be (select one):

**Option 1:** ☑ a new Annuity Starting Date upon recommencement.

**Option 2:** ❌ no new Annuity Starting Date upon recommencement.

**NOTE:** If no option is selected, Option 2 will apply. A Plan subject to the Qualified Joint and Survivor Annuity provisions must follow the procedures described in IRS Notice 97-75, Q&A-8 regarding Annuity Starting Dates.

### Part C. Definition of Eligible Rollover Distribution

For purposes of the Direct Rollover distribution provisions of the Plan, the following will also be treated as Eligible Rollover Distributions (select one):

**Option 1:** ☑ 2009 RMDs and Extended 2009 RMDs.

**Option 2:** ❌ 2009 RMDs.

**Option 3:** ❌ Neither 2009 RMDs nor Extended 2009 RMDs.

**NOTE:** If no option is selected, Option 1 will apply.

**EMPLOYER SIGNATURE**

Signature of Employer

1. I acknowledge that I have relied upon my own advisers regarding the completion of the Amendment and the legal and tax implications of amending this Plan;
2. I understand that my failure to properly complete the Amendment may result in disqualification of the Plan; and
3. I have received a copy of the Amendment.

Signature of Adopting Employer

Date Signed

Type Name

Title
Heroes Earnings and Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (HEART) Adoption Agreement Amendment

This amendment of the Plan (hereinafter referred to as “the Amendment”) is comprised of this Heroes Earnings and Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (HEART) Adoption Agreement Amendment (the “Adoption Agreement Amendment”) and the corresponding Basic Plan Document Amendment. The Amendment is adopted to reflect the provisions of the Heroes Earnings and Assistance Relief Tax Act of 2008 (HEART). The Amendment is intended to provide good faith compliance with HEART and related guidance until the Plan is formally restated to incorporate such guidance. The Amendment is effective as specified in this Adoption Agreement Amendment except as otherwise provided in the Basic Plan Document Amendment. The Amendment supersedes the existing provisions of the Plan to the extent that those provisions are inconsistent with the provisions of the Amendment.

EMPLOYER INFORMATION

Name of Plan: American Society of Mechanical Engineers DC Pension Plan
Plan Sequence Number 201    Account Number 103534

CONTRIBUTIONS

Complete Part A

Part A. Benefit Accrual in the Case of Death or Disability Resulting from Qualified Military Service
Will the benefit accrual provisions under Code Section 414(u)(9) apply to individuals who are unable to be reemployed on account of death or Disability while performing qualified military service as defined in Code Section 414(u) (select one)?
Option 1: ☐ Yes, effective ____________ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2007, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 2: ☑ No.
NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 2 will apply.

VESTING AND FORFEITURES

Complete Part A

Part A. Vesting in the Case of Disability Resulting from Qualified Military Service
Will Years of Vesting Service be credited to individuals who are unable to be reemployed on account of Disability while performing qualified military service as defined in Code Section 414(u) (select one)?
Option 1: ☐ Yes, effective ____________ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2007, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 2: ☑ No.
Option 3: ☐ Not applicable. Individuals become 100% Vested upon Disability under the terms of the Plan.
NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 2 will apply. Regardless of which option is selected, individuals who are unable to be reemployed on account of death while performing qualified military service must be credited with Years of Vesting Service.

DISTRIBUTIONS

Complete Part A

Part A. Deemed Severance from Employment
May a Participant request a distribution of their Elective Deferrals and earnings on account of Deemed Severance from Employment while performing military service as defined in Code Section 3401(h)(2)(A) (select one)?
Option 1: ☑ Yes, effective ____________ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2009, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 2: ☐ No.
NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 1 will apply.

DEFINITIONS

Complete Part A

Part A. Differential Wage Payments
Unless a different definition of Compensation is required by either the Code or ERISA, will Differential Wage Payments be included in Compensation for contribution, allocation and other general Plan purposes (select one)?
Option 1: ☑ Yes, effective ____________ (Specify a date that is on or after January 1, 2009, or, if later, the Effective Date of the Plan.)
Option 2: ☐ No.
NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 1 will apply and the effective date will be the later of January 1, 2009, or the Effective Date of the Plan.
Signature of Employer

1. I acknowledge that I have relied upon my own advisers regarding the completion of the Amendment and the legal and tax implications of amending this Plan;
2. I understand that my failure to properly complete the Amendment may result in disqualification of the Plan; and
3. I have received a copy of the Amendment.

Signature of Adopting Employer __________________________ Date Signed __________
Type Name __________________________ Title __________________________
Worker, Retiree and Employer Recovery Act of 2008 (WRERA) Adoption Agreement Amendment

This amendment of the Plan (hereinafter referred to as "the Amendment") is comprised of this Worker, Retiree and Employer Recovery Act of 2008 (WRERA) Adoption Agreement Amendment (the "Adoption Agreement Amendment") and the corresponding Basic Plan Document Amendment. The Amendment is adopted to reflect the provisions of WRERA. The Amendment is intended to provide good faith compliance with WRERA and related guidance until the Plan is formally restated to incorporate such guidance. The Amendment is effective January 1, 2009, and such provisions apply to Plan operations during the period beginning on December 1, 2009, and ending on December 31, 2009. The IRS will not consider the Plan to have failed to operate in accordance with its terms merely because during the period beginning on January 1, 2009, and ending on November 30, 2009, the Plan’s operation conflicted with the provisions of the Amendment pertaining to required minimum distributions (RMDs) for 2009. The Amendment supersedes the existing provisions of the Plan to the extent that those provisions are inconsistent with the provisions of the Amendment.

EMPLOYER INFORMATION

Name of Plan  American Society of Mechanical Engineers DC Pension Plan
Plan Sequence Number  201  Account Number  103534

DISTRIBUTIONS
Complete Parts A through C

Part A. 2009 RMD Payment Election
May Participants and Beneficiaries who would have otherwise been required to receive RMDs for 2009 but for the enactment of Code Section 401(a)(9)(1-1) choose whether to remove their 2009 RMD or Extended 2009 RMD from the Plan (select one)?

Option 1: Yes. (Complete the following)
If a Participant or Beneficiary does not choose whether to remove their 2009 RMD or Extended 2009 RMD, the Employer will (select one):
Suboption (a): retain such amount within the Plan.
Suboption (b): distribute such amount to the Participant or Beneficiary.
NOTE: If no suboption is selected, Suboption (a) will apply.

Option 2: No. (Complete the following)
The Employer will (select one):
Suboption (a): retain such amount within the Plan.
Suboption (b): distribute such amount to the Participant or Beneficiary.
NOTE: If no suboption is selected, Suboption (a) will apply.

NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 1 will apply. If Option 2, Suboption (a) is selected, ERISA Section 204(g) may be violated if no other distribution event is available to a Participant or Beneficiary under the Plan. Generally, ERISA Section 204(g) prohibits the elimination of protected benefits and protected benefits include the timing of payout options. Refer to ERISA Section 204(g) and the corresponding Treasury regulation for details pertaining to the elimination of an otherwise protected benefit.

Part B. Annuity Starting Dates
If a 2009 RMD or Extended 2009 RMD is not removed from the Plan, there will be (select one):
Option 1: a new Annuity Starting Date upon recommencement.
Option 2: no new Annuity Starting Date upon recommencement.
NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 2 will apply. A Plan subject to the Qualified Joint and Survivor Annuity provisions must follow the procedures described in IRS Notice 97-75, Q&A-8 regarding Annuity Starting Dates.

Part C. Definition of Eligible Rollover Distribution
For purposes of the Direct Rollover distribution provisions of the Plan, the following will also be treated as Eligible Rollover Distributions (select one):
Option 1: 2009 RMDs and Extended 2009 RMDs.
Option 2: 2009 RMDs.
Option 3: Neither 2009 RMDs nor Extended 2009 RMDs.
NOTE: If no option is selected, Option 1 will apply.

EMPLOYER SIGNATURE

Signature of Employer  ____________________________  Date Signed  __________  
Type Name  ____________________________  Title  ____________________________
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Date Submitted: January 26, 2012
BOG Meeting Date: February 16, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) Public Affairs and Outreach Sector
Presented by: Stacey Swisher Harnetty, Senior Vice President
Agenda Title: Updated ASME Position Paper on Professional Licensure

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

The ASME Board on Students and Early Career recently updated ASME’s BOG-approved 2008 position paper, “Mandatory Educational Requirements for Engineering Licensure.” It was a minor update, primarily changing the references to B.S. + 30 to the new terminology of “Master’s or Equivalent,” as well as updating the statistics.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

The BOG would like to approve the updated ASME position paper on professional licensure.

Attachments:
Mandatory Educational Requirements for Engineering Licensure

~

General Position Paper
Approved by the
American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME)
Board of Governors
April 25, 2008; update pending approval

----------
Endorsed by (pending):

American Institute of Chemical Engineers (AIChe)

American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE)

Executive Board of the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) Engineering Deans Council

Illuminating Engineering Society (IES)

Institute of Industrial Engineers (IIE)

International Society of Automation (ISA)

Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration Inc. (SME)

The Minerals, Metals and Materials Society (TMS)

The Society of Naval Architects & Marine Engineers (SNAME)
Introduction

Founded in 1880 as the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, ASME is a not-for-profit professional organization recognized globally for its leadership in providing the engineering community with technical content and a forum for information exchange. With more than 120,000 members worldwide, ASME serves this wide-ranging technical community through high-quality programs in continuing education, the development and maintenance of codes and standards, research, conferences and publications, government relations, and various forms of outreach.

ASME endorses lifelong learning and encourages mechanical engineers to pursue graduate degrees in engineering. As the quality of engineering education improves around the world, in order to remain globally competitive, engineers who wish to advance in their careers will need to continue their education either through formal study leading to a degree, or through the various types of continuing education that are offered.

In addition to ASME, the following organizations, representing more than 300,000 engineers, have endorsed this position statement:

- American Institute of Chemical Engineers (AIChE) representing over 40,000 members;
- American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE) representing 51,000 members;
- Executive Board of the American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE) Engineering Deans Council;
- Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) representing 9,000 members;
- Institute of Industrial Engineers (IIE) representing 13,000 members;
- International Society of Automation (ISA) representing 30,000 members;
- Society for Mining, Metallurgy, and Exploration Inc. (SME) representing 13,000 members;
- The Minerals, Metals and Materials Society (TMS) representing nearly 10,000 members; and
- The Society of Naval Architects & Marine Engineers (SNAME) representing over 8,500 members.

Background

In 2006, the National Council of Examiners for Engineers and Surveyors (NCEES) adopted a change to the Model Law for professional engineers to require that, for an individual to be licensed by a state as a Professional Engineer (PE) in 2015 and beyond, he or she must hold at least a Master’s degree in an engineering discipline or its equivalent (MOE). In 2008, NCEES extended the implementation timeline to 2020. NCEES claims that it was motivated to add additional credits, due to the decline in university and college requirements for a bachelor’s degree in engineering from an average of 144 credits 25 years ago to an average of 128 credits today.

The First Professional Degree (FPD) in engineering has long been considered to be the degree needed for the practice of engineering. The FPD informs the public and licensing bodies about the minimum requirements that qualify an aspiring professional for practice. Since the 1920s, the FPD in engineering in most regions of the world has been a baccalaureate degree, requiring the equivalent of full time study of approximately four years.
Current engineering baccalaureate degrees typically require courses in mathematics; exact sciences and life sciences; fundamentals and practice of engineering; laboratory and design experience; metrology and experimentation; ethics and professionalism; and selected topics from other disciplines, including the liberal arts and business. Some programs also include industry-based experience in the form of cooperative education or internships.

**ASME Position Statement on Master’s or Equivalent (MOE)**

ASME opposes a mandatory, across-the-board requirement of MOE, beyond the FPD currently decreed by tradition and practice.

ASME believes that the typical scope of an ABET Accredited bachelor’s degree can be and has been demonstrated to accommodate technical breadth and flexibility and the intellectual skills necessary for engineering graduates to qualify for employment in an engineering position. In addition, it is the appropriate qualification to attain licensure as a Professional Engineer. The steps in achieving that status are: (1) passing the Fundamentals of Engineering Examination, (2) successfully completing a four-year internship under a licensed engineer and (3) passing the final Principles and Practices Examination. Before being licensed as a Professional Engineer, these steps assure that the knowledge, skill and ethical standards expected from a Professional Engineer are attained. Continuing education is essential to the attainment and maintenance of licensure, as well as a life-long necessity for engineers of all disciplines beyond the studies that qualified them for the FPD. Continuing education helps PEs stay up-to-date with developments beyond their classroom and professional experience.

ASME believes that increasing educational requirements for licensure should not be used as a tool to offset the nominal decrease in graduation requirements for the FPD. Over the past decades, legislatures and state higher education authorities have reduced the course load required for a baccalaureate degree in engineering, from as high as 150 to the mid-130s (some as low as 120 semester credits), for budgetary and efficiency reasons. In the past decade, the average decrease was a mere 1.5 semester hours. Yet, this gradual change over time has resulted in no drop in the national test scores in either examination required for engineering licensure. In order to produce such results, the approach to educating an engineer has had to become more focused and efficient. Improved technology has also contributed significantly, i.e. computers have replaced slide rules, etc. Thus, the need for increased hours is not required.

The reason for engineering licensure is to protect the safety, health and welfare of the public (as stated in the National Society of Professional Engineers Code of Ethics and in the codes of most of the other engineering societies). Legislation in these matters should be used for the purpose of public safety only. Increasing the prestige or status of the profession by raising the bar to access does not contribute to the profession nor does it serve the public. The value and effectiveness of the work that engineers do should be the sole measure of the profession. Professionalism and continuous education across the decades of an engineering career, together with strict adherence to the canons of ethics, is the real foundation of public safety.

We currently have a workable, effective and adaptable system of examinations and supervision in practice that results in highly competent professional engineers. We also have a system of state oversight
that can take action against an individual engineer or part of the system that can be demonstrated to have fallen short of professional expectations. If more front-end coursework is the remedy, it should be employed because public safety is at risk due to poorly educated engineers. This is not the case now, nor are we seeing early indicators that it will be the case in the foreseeable future.

The people of the United States and the Legislative and Executive branches of the U.S. government are concerned with enhancing the nation's capabilities in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM). To compete in the modern technological society and global economy, it is imperative that we expand our technologically capable workforce.

However, the low number of engineering students in four-year colleges has been going in the wrong direction nationally, as cited in the statistics below:

- In 1981, 6.7 percent of degrees awarded in the U.S. were in engineering. In 1986, the figure rose to a high of 7.8 percent. Today it has dropped to 4.3 percent.¹
- Since 1986, the number of U.S. bachelor’s degrees earned in engineering has declined by 10.7 percent.²
- From 1994 to 2009, the number of doctorates awarded annually by U.S. universities to U.S. citizens or permanent residents in engineering rose by only 95 to 3,148, even experiencing a sharp decline between 1994 and 2004.³

The engineering degree is one of the most challenging programs of study that one may undertake at the university and requiring a Master’s or Equivalent will make becoming an engineer appear even more difficult, which could further detract some of the highly capable students needed to ensure U.S. technological growth. Increasing the professional licensing requirements also has the potential to reduce the supply of licensed engineers who are able to practice and therefore reduce the U.S.’s technological competitiveness.

Because technological change is continuous over the typical 40 years of a professional engineering career, the additional courses taken at the beginning of a career have a rapidly decreasing usefulness compared to the continuing education required in most states to maintain licensure. In addition, many graduates are required to take highly specialized short courses, unavailable in universities, relating to their new job duties. The equivalency of these courses to formal academic classes has not been resolved.

There is also no evidence to suggest that earning a Master’s or adding thirty credit hours, which represents a full academic year of upper-level undergraduate coursework or graduate-level coursework, will have a positive impact on the public’s health and safety. The fundamental issues affecting the public are already adequately covered under the current education, testing and experience requirements.

² Ibid.
³ Doctorate Recipients from U.S. Universities, National Science Foundation, access December 9, 2011.
We believe that it is misguided to add a year of coursework on the front-end of a professional career as a 
remedy to a public safety problem that has not been demonstrated. It will discourage students from 
seeking a career in engineering by significantly adding to the time and cost of their education.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, ASME opposes a mandatory, across the board requirement of MOE, beyond the FPD 
currently decreed by tradition and practice, for the following reasons:

- ASME believes that the typical scope of an ABET Accredited bachelor’s degree can and has 
been demonstrated to accommodate technical breadth and flexibility and the intellectual skills 
necessary for engineering graduates to (1) pass the Fundamentals of Engineering Examination, 
(2) successfully complete a four-year internship under a licensed engineer and (3) go on to pass 
the final Principles and Practices Examination before being licensed as a Professional Engineer.

- Continuing education is an essential life-long need for engineers, and significant learning is 
necessary for engineers of all disciplines beyond the studies that qualified them for the FPD. 
These principles are already incorporated within the present system as most states require 
professional development credits to maintain licensure.

- There is no clear benefit to requiring MOE, but there is considerable cost that will affect both 
firms and individuals (tuition, time off, fees, books, commuting, etc.).

- Due to the federated nature of licensing jurisdictions, some states may adopt MOE and others 
will not, causing disparities and hindering licensee mobility. Equivalency of other non-
university-based courses also will be a major concern.

- Engineers rank high in national polls compared to lawyers and other professionals and therefore 
there is no need to increase educational requirements to achieve additional prestige.

- ASME will continue to review the body of knowledge required for entry-level engineers not 
from the standpoint of professional registration, which has been addressed above, but from the 
standpoint of the global competitiveness of graduating mechanical engineers.

ASME believes legislating this new barrier to entry into the profession is not in the public’s interest and 
comes at the expense of engineering students, their parents, and anyone who employs engineering 
services.

This General Position Paper was approved by the ASME Board of Governors on February XX, 2012.
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BOG Meeting Date: February 16, 2012

To: Board of Governors
From: (Sector/Unit/Task Force/Other) Public Affairs and Outreach Sector
Presented by: On Consent Agenda
Agenda Title: Updated ASME Diversity Position Paper

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

The ASME Committee on Diversity and Inclusion Strategy recently updated ASME’s BOG-approved 2009 diversity position paper, “Diversity and Inclusion in the U.S. STEM Workforce: A National Imperative.” It was a minor update, primarily changing the title of the document to “Diversity and Inclusion in the STEM Workforce: A Strategic Global Imperative” and updating the statistics. The Senior Vice President of Public Affairs and Outreach has now approved the updated paper, and is submitting it for the BOG’s consideration.

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

The BOG would like to approve the updated ASME diversity position paper.

Attachments:
General Position Paper of ASME on Diversity and Inclusion in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Workforce: A Strategic Global Imperative

ASME is committed to achieving a truly diverse and inclusive science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) workforce in the U.S. and all over the world. We offer the following guiding principles to help ASME and the broader STEM community to better envision and implement the concept of diversity and inclusion in the STEM workforce.

Guiding Principles:

1. Diversity is defined as “the ways in which we differ as individuals or organizations, and the commonalities and similarities that justify and motivate all people and entities to work collaboratively together in order to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes.”

   It includes differences such as age, gender, ethnicity, physical appearance, thought styles, religion, nationality, socio-economic status, belief systems, sexual orientation and education. Diversity that is recognized, valued and most importantly, strategically managed within and without an organization can drive successful outcomes and business results.”

2. Inclusion is “creation of opportunities and the elimination of barriers that allow all people to participate in and contribute to ideation, planning, projects, programs, processes, teams, organizations, social activities, fun or any other meaningful opportunity, that helps achieve successful outcomes.”

3. Strategic Diversity is “the effective deployment of strategies that leverage the strengths of all people and/or of an organization in order to operate successfully within a diverse marketplace or within a uniquely different society, institution, partnership or similar entity.”

4. Managing Diversity is “the ability to effectively inspire and enable all people to:
   a. align to a common vision
   b. communicate effectively and assure understanding
   c. know and accept what is of value to others
   d. leverage the strengths of others and trust their commitment to deliver as agreed, and
   e. appropriately recognize and celebrate successes often.”

Policy Recommendations:

Specific to the U.S., ASME would like to proffer the following policy recommendations. In 2010, women were awarded 18.1% of engineering degrees, while African Americans and Hispanics

\[1\] ASME Policy 15.11. ASME Policy on Diversity and Inclusion.
represented only 4.5% and 7% respectively. While these numbers do represent significant gains from the 1980s, there is still much work that needs to be done.

The U.S. economy relies on the productivity, creativity, and entrepreneurship of all U.S. citizens. With the predicted changes in future U.S. workforce demographics, increasing the participation of women and underrepresented groups in the U.S. STEM workforce must become a 21st Century national imperative. We urge policymakers to strengthen and re-examine oversight of existing legislation and programs aimed specifically at broadening participation by under-represented groups in STEM fields, including that which:

- Increases public awareness of STEM careers, including supporting efforts to foster outreach to all students, teachers, parents, and K-12 guidance counselors;

- Enables all students to have access to a rigorous STEM curriculum, hands-on laboratory experiences, and informal learning that increases academic performance and interest in STEM careers;

- Offers incentives and mentoring for women and under-represented groups to pursue STEM coursework and careers, including teaching careers, and continue to provide professional achievement opportunities post-graduation and throughout their careers;

- Provides all members of society the opportunity to fully participate in the STEM pipeline and workforce by addressing current obstacles to the participation of women and underrepresented groups in the STEM workforce, as well as ensuring to acknowledge past accomplishments.

By dramatically improving the participation of women and talent from other under-represented groups in the STEM workforce, the U.S. can leverage the diversity of these individuals to fuel the innovation necessary for our global competitiveness, as well as meet the challenges of a changing world.

XXX 2012

---
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To: Board of Governors
From: PAO Council/Board on Education
Presented by: Stacey Swisher-Harnetty/William Wepfer
Agenda Title: Revision - ABET ME Degree Program Accreditation Criteria

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

Rationale: The recent ASME Vision 2030 Roadmap for the future of mechanical engineering education made several recommendations including one for a more flexible curriculum. The proposed change in the curricular part of the ME Program Criteria will “enable students to develop understanding of mechanical engineering fundamentals but also offer greater strength in context and realization of design, a better systems perspective, and the possibility of focus in an area of interest. Thus, the model of a required ME “core” set of fundamental classes, followed by a concentration area is suggested, echoing recommendations of earlier studies.”

The proposed change in the faculty part of the ME Program Criteria attempts to assist ME program evaluators in assessing the adequacy of faculty size by broadening the metrics to include not only the existing EAC of ABET Student Outcomes (a)-(k) but also to include other common metrics such as “student-to-faculty ratio” as well as undergraduate degrees granted per year per faculty member. This is driven, in part, by the ten-year 43% increase in mechanical engineering enrollments and the need to maintain the quality of mechanical engineering programs.

Path forward on approval. ASME Staff will forward to ABET where this will be considered by the EAC of ABET at its Summer Commission Meeting (July 2012) and then by the ABET Board of Directors (October 2012). If approved, the proposed changes will go out for a one year public comment period, be reaffirmed by the EAC of ABET (July 2013) and the ABET Board (October 2013) and would then go into effect with the 2014-15 EAC of ABET evaluation cycle.

Proposed motion for BOG Action: (if appropriate)

That the attached revisions to the ABET Program Criteria for Mechanical Engineering and Similarly Named Engineering Programs be approved and changes recommended to the ABET Commission on Engineering Accreditation and Board of Directors.

Attachments:

ASME-ABET Program Criteria for Mechanical and Similarly Named Engineering Programs
PROGRAM CRITERIA FOR
MECHANICAL
AND SIMILARLY NAMED ENGINEERING PROGRAMS

Lead Society: American Society of Mechanical Engineers

These program criteria will apply to all engineering programs including "mechanical" or similar modifiers in their titles.

1. Curriculum

The curriculum must require students to apply principles of engineering, basic science, and mathematics (including multivariate calculus and differential equations); to model, analyze, design, and realize physical systems, components or processes; and prepare students to work professionally in both either thermal and or mechanical systems areas while having requiring courses in each area.

2. Faculty

The program must demonstrate that faculty members responsible for the upper-level professional program are maintaining currency in their specialty area. Faculty size should accommodate appropriate engagement with students as reflected in the attainment of student outcomes as well as in such measures as student-to-faculty ratio and the number of bachelor’s degrees granted per year per faculty member.