NEA Open Hearing on Proposed Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules Thursday, June 20, 2024 Questions from Delegates Received During Hearing

| Constitutional Amendment 1 TITLE: To strike language that proportionally adjusts ratios for merged affiliate delegate credentials to the NEA RA based on the reduction in dues paid by Active members of such affiliates. | | |
|--|---|--|
| What impact will this have on dues paid to NEA? Will dues increase if voting rights are increased? | Dues are not impacted through this proposed amendment. Dues are addressed in a different area of NEA's governing documents. | |
| Would this change affect only the number of delegates allocated to merged states or would it also affect other counts based on membership, for example NEA Director or Resolutions Committee member positions? | Only delegate allocations. | |
| Has there been any action from the American Federation of Teachers (AFT) of a similar nature to increase delegation size in merged state associations? | No, AFT does not use an adjustment for affiliate delegations to its national meeting. | |
| Do NEA members in merged affiliates also have voting rights in AFT? | Yes. Active members who pay dues to both national organizations have governance rights to both. | |
| Constitutional Amendment 2 TITLE: To require that NEA provide a virtual option for participation at all Representative Assemblies. | | |
| Is there info on the cost difference of a hybrid RA? | This information is provided in the impact statement for this proposed amendment, which states that, in 2022, conducting the Representative Assembly via both in-person and virtual means cost the Association an additional \$5 million over and above, or instead of, the cost of a fully in-person RA. | |
| For digital access, would this include time for speakers to adequately communicate with those delegates who depend on captions? Would this include virtual attendee ability to participate in floor activities such as speaking at microphones? | Yes, the intention of any virtual option would be to seek to ensure equitable access by both inperson and virtual participants. Yes. | |

Constitutional Amendment 3

Title: To require that at least one member of the Executive Committee be a current education support professional.

| How would this amendment affect the terms of current Executive Committee members? | No change to current terms. |
|---|--|
| Does the maker envision this as a special seat specifically for ESP members? | Yes. |
| Has there ever been an ESP member on the Executive Committee and if so, when was the last time? | Yes. The last Active member employed as an ESP to serve on the Executive Committee was elected to consecutive three-year terms in 2013-2016 and 2016-2019. |
| How many ESP members are on the NEA Board of Directors? | NEA's requirements for ESP positions on the NEA Board in proportion to Active ESP membership in the Association currently requires 21 state and at-large elected ESP positions on the Board. |
| What would happen if no ESP were nominated for the position? | As provided in the impact statement for this proposed amendment, prior to the close of nominations, NEA would conduct outreach to ESP-centric groups, such as the National Council for Education Support Professionals (NCESP) to advise of nomination and election for the open position. |
| What would happen if no ESP member ran for the position, even after NEA solicited groups regarding the nomination and election for the open position? | While this scenario would be unlikely, NEA would address this by adhering to policies that govern Executive Committee vacancies set forth in NEA Bylaw 6-3. |
| Are there other role-specific allocations for the NEA Executive Committee? | No. The positions are open to all NEA Active members. All candidates for office must have been Active members for two years preceding the election. There is a minimum 20 percent ethnic minority requirement for the committee composition. |
| Is this amendment intended to address the cost required for candidates to run for NEA Executive Committee? | Per the maker, yes, cost of running for national office is part of the concern. Equitable is the primary reason for the proposed amendment. |

Bylaw Amendment 1

TITLE: To strike language providing for proportionate delegate allocation to merged states for specific membership categories.

| Who would be responsible for the cost of | Any increased allocation of delegates resulting |
|--|---|
| additional delegates? | from adoption of this amendment, such as |
| | increased funding based on additionally |
| | allocated, elected, and registered delegates, |

| | would be the responsibility of the merged state association. |
|---|---|
| Are the Bylaw amendment and the Constitutional amendment contingent on one another for successful passage? | No. One may be adopted without reliance on adoption of the other. |
| Do merged states have the option to "unmerge" to acquire full representation? | This option would not be likely given the significant restructuring of a merged affiliate that would be necessary; the maker also notes that merged affiliation adds to their respective organization's power and unification. |
| What is the financial reasoning for merged states to get reduced dues? | This is a misconception as members in merged states may, in some circumstances, pay a lower dues obligation to NEA, but overall they are paying a combined dues amount to both NEA and the American Federation of Teachers. |
| What state associations are merged? If these amendments passed, how many delegates would merged state affiliates have at the NEA Representative Assembly? | To review changes in allocation of delegates in merged state affiliates, please refer to the tables provided in the impact statements for Constitutional Amendment 1 and Bylaw Amendment 1. |
| How many delegates are eligible to attend versus the number of delegates registered? | This will vary from state association to state association and local association to local association in which delegates are allocated. Overall, at the 2023 RA, the total number of allocated seats across all state and local associations was 14,245, while total number of registered delegates in attendance in Orlando was 5,455. |
| Bylaw Amendment 2 Title: To require NEA to provide all delegations app Assembly, including medical and legal implications | olicable travel advisories prior to the Representative, based on the meeting location. |
| Doesn't NEA already issues these types of advisories? | It does and has as recently as 2023 for the NEA Annual Meeting and Representative Assembly in Orlando, FL. |
| Is there a financial implication for the impact of this Bylaw? | As noted in the impact statement provided by the committee for this Bylaw, there is no stated financial implication for its implementation. |
| Bylaw Amendment 3 Title: To add Representative Assembly Delegates to Committees are accountable, and to outline specific | _ |
| How is this different from current practice? | As provided in the impact statement, if adopted, the amendment would add NEA delegates to the list of groups to whom committees are |

| | accountable. The amendment would also outline specific items that must be included in the committee reports. Among these, including staff hours spent on completing work directed by the committee would be different from current required practice. Committee reports currently include the committee charges and committee member names. If the amendment is adopted, NEA will ask committee chairs and staff liaisons to include the requested information about staff time in their final reports. |
|---|---|
| Bylaw Amendment 4 Title: To add Middle Eastern or North African to NE | A's definition of "Ethnic Minority". |
| Can you provide additional detail on the cost implications for this proposed amendment? | The impact statement indicates an initial cost of \$24,500 to redesign NEA membership systems to include Middle Eastern or North African (MENA) as an option to select for self-identifying one's race/ethnicity. The \$543,000 amount is the estimated cost for fielding an Association-wide survey of all members if NEA determined that a full-member survey were deemed necessary to provide the opportunity for allowing previously enrolled NEA members to self-identify as MENA if they so choose. |
| What identities comprise the Middle Eastern or North African category? | According to the Bureau of the Census, the category includes Arab-speaking groups, non-Arab speaking groups, and transnational groups as follows: Algerian, Arab, Assyrian, Bahraini, Berber, Chaldean, Egyptian, Emirati, Iranian, Iraqi, Israeli, Jordanian, Kurdish, Kuwaiti, Lebanese, Libyan, Moroccan, Omani, Palestinian, Qatari, Saudi, Syriac, Syrian, Tunisian, Yazidi, Yemeni, and Other Middle Eastern and North African. |
| Would this have a bearing on Bylaw 3-1(g) numerical goals for state delegations? | Yes. Such members who self-identified as MENA as a designation provided by NEA member and elected delegate reporting systems would be counted toward a state delegation's numerical goals for 3-1(g) numerical goal attainment. However, changes to state delegation numerical goals themselves would not be impacted until the release of the next decennial U.S. Census, which is scheduled for 2030. |

Standing Rule Amendment 1

Title: To require immediate announcement by the chair and display on screens of the updated cost of any new business item following adoption of an amendment.

No questions submitted during hearing by delegates for this proposed amendment.

Standing Rule Amendment 2

Title: To require all original makers of NBIs be given one minute to speak when another delegate moves to refer their NBIs to the appropriate committee.

No questions submitted during hearing by delegates for this proposed amendment.

Standing Rule Amendment 3

Title: To require automatic referral to the appropriate committee of any new business items not brought to the floor for debate prior to adjournment.

No questions submitted during hearing by delegates for this proposed amendment.

Standing Rule Amendment 4

Title: To strike language requiring submission of amendments to proposed new business items no later than two hours prior to the start of the Representative Assembly on the day on which the item is to be considered.

| Was the prior change made because of the hybrid | The change originated during virtual and hybrid |
|---|--|
| RA? | RAs but was adopted by RA delegates for |
| | purposes of NEA Standing Rules applicable to in- |
| | person meetings. |

Standing Rule Amendment 5

Title: To increase the number of speakers for and against a motion prior to consideration of a motion to close debate.

| Would this also apply to New Business Items that | Yes. |
|--|---|
| have been bundled? | |
| Would this expand the time needed for New | It could extend action on individual NBIs or policy |
| Business and other policy items at the RA? | reports, but the amount of time in any given day |
| | at the RA is finite and includes a scheduled time |
| | to conclude on the final day. |
| | |

Standing Rule Amendment 6

Title: To change the deadline for maker modifications to new business items from three days to one day prior to the opening of the Representative Assembly.

| What would be the cost to implement this? | An additional issue of the RA Today would have |
|---|--|
| | to be printed for the first day of the RA that |
| | included any modifications submitted the prior |

| | day. This would result in an additional cost of |
|--|--|
| | \$72,725 for each RA. |
| How has the current rule impacted NBI | The current rule allows the Committee on |
| submissions and delivery to delegates? | Constitution, Bylaws, and Rules and supporting staff additional time to process all NBIs and provide all NBIs to delegates ahead of the start of the RA. |

Standing Rule Amendment 7

Title: To increase the minimum amount of time allocated to consideration of new business items at the start of each business meeting.

| If we were just accounting for time dedicated to | The RA generally ends at 8:00pm on the last day. |
|--|---|
| New Business Items, how much later might we | Each hour beyond 8:00pm costs the Association |
| expect the RA to adjourn on the last day? | approximately an additional \$20,000. |
| What could be removed from the RA agenda to | If it were necessary, this would fall to the |
| add more NBI time? | decision-making of the NEA president who is |
| | tasked with setting the agenda for the annual RA. |
| Could a delegate currently suspend the Standing | Yes. |
| Rules to allow for this? | |
| How much time has traditionally been allocated | By way of example, in 2023 there were 12 hours |
| in total for NBIs? | across the four days of the RA devoted to |
| | consideration of NBIs. |

Standing Rule Amendment 8

Title: To codify the existing practice of providing makers at least three reports a year on implementation of their new business items, and to require at least one opportunity for makers to provide input on implementation progress.

| If an NBI passed on the RA floor and the version | The ma |
|--|--------|
| adopted varied significantly from what the maker | provid |
| proposed, how would input from the maker | of ame |
| during implementation work? | NBI du |

The maker may still be given the opportunity to provide feedback on implementation regardless of amendments proposed and adopted for the NBI during the course of delegate debate.

Standing Rule Amendment 9

Title: To require the chair to announce the number of speakers remaining in the queue prior to any vote on a motion to close debate when there have been fewer than three speakers on each side.

| How would we know whether speakers who | We would not know. |
|--|--------------------|
| submit for or against are planning to speak to the | |
| motion and not to move some other | |
| parliamentary procedure? | |
| Could this procedure result in strategically filling | It could. |
| a queue on one side or the other without true | |
| intention to speak? | |
| | |

| Standing Ru | ıle Ame | endment | 10 |
|-------------|---------|---------|----|
|-------------|---------|---------|----|

Title: To require the Annual Meeting Review Committee to meet with makers of items referred to the committee to ascertain the intent of the item.

| Could the meeting be virtual or does it have to be | Virtual convenings would meet the requirements |
|--|--|
| in-person? | of this provision. |
| Would the entire committee have to meet with | One committee serving as spokesperson for |
| the maker or could one committee member meet | committee would meet the requirements of this |
| with the maker as liaison for the committee? | provision. |

Standing Rule Amendment 11

Title: To require that all committee reports be available to RA delegates digitally no later than June 1.

| When does each committee submit their final | Committees accountable to the NEA Board of |
|---|---|
| reports to the RA? | Directors submit their final reports in conjunction |
| | with the May meeting of the Board, and as such |
| | would be able to meet the requirements set forth |
| | in this proposed amendment. The Resolutions |
| | Committee also issues its Summary of Winter |
| | Meeting Actions and pre-RA report for delegates |
| | prior to June 1. Under NEA Standing Rule 7, the |
| | Resolutions Committee convenes just prior to the |
| | beginning of the Representative Assembly to |
| | complete and publish its final report on the first |
| | day of the RA. |
| Would this delay the accessible versions of these | Per the information provided in the impact |
| documents being produced in order to meet the | statement for this proposed amendment, as |
| requirements of this rule? | feasible, and depending on the calendar date of |
| | the NEA Board's spring meeting, it may not be |
| | possible to post fully designed, formatted, |
| | accessible versions of all reports by a required |
| | posting date of June 1. In such cases NEA would |
| | post a temporary version of such reports by the |
| | required deadline and replace with final |
| | formatted versions once available. |