# Proposal to Amend Bylaws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal #</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Proposed by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1702</td>
<td>Collegiate Director Eligibility</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>4.D.</td>
<td>Cheryl Manning, Kelly Schable, Esther A. Heller, Kerrie Greenfelder, Carol Bachman, Eileen M. Vélez-Vega, Andrea Stenberg, Andrea Karalus, Mary Kinsella, Jenny Morikawa, Brenda Wolfe, Holli Pheil (FY16 Nominating Committee)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Current Language:

The collegiate director must:
1. Be a collegiate member of the Society in good standing for the immediately previous year;
2. Be a member of the Society in good standing; and
3. Have at least two years experience in the aggregate in at least two SWE positions with significant leadership responsibility.

## Proposed Changes:

The **Candidates for** collegiate director must:
1. Be a collegiate member of the Society in good standing **at the time the nomination is submitted**; for the immediately previous year; and
2. Be a member of the Society in good standing; and
3. At the time of taking office, have at least two years experience in the aggregate in at least two SWE positions with significant leadership responsibility.

## If Adopted:

Candidates for collegiate director must:
1. Be a collegiate member of the Society in good standing at the time the nomination is submitted; and
2. At the time of taking office, have at least two years experience in the aggregate in at least two SWE positions with significant leadership responsibility.

## Rationale:

Sections 4A, 4B, 4C all begin "Candidates for." This change will make the collegiate director eligibility language consistent with the other three and clarify that the candidate must currently be a SWE collegiate member at the time they submit their nomination.

### Pro:

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

### Con:

None.

## Bylaws Committee Comments:

This is an alternate version of 1608 to take into account the original proposers’ intent.