

**BOARD COMPOSITION**

Staggering Terms: Protecting Institutional Memory

No law requires it, which is exactly why it has to be chosen on purpose

Nothing in the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) requires a company limited by guarantee to stagger its board's terms. For incorporated associations, terms are set by your rules, or by your jurisdiction's model rules if you have adopted them, so check those before redesigning. This is worth stating plainly, because staggered terms are sometimes discussed as though they were a compliance requirement rather than what they actually are: a deliberate constitutional design choice, which the board can propose and members can adopt, and which many associations never consider on purpose.

Which rules apply to your association?

The law depends on how your association is set up. A **company limited by guarantee** follows the Corporations Act 2001 (Cth) and its constitution. An **incorporated association** follows its state or territory associations Act and its rules. A **registered charity** also follows the ACNC Act and the ACNC Governance Standards, and some Corporations Act rules are replaced for charities that are companies. Check your own governing documents, and get advice before decisions with legal consequences.

In this resource

1. [The Problem Staggering Actually Solves](#)
2. [The Mechanics Of A Staggered Structure](#)
3. [The Real Trade-Off, Stated Honestly](#)
4. [Building It Into Your Own Constitution](#)

The Problem Staggering Actually Solves

The previous article covered succession planning. Staggering addresses a related structural risk: what happens when several long-serving directors, all elected around the same time, reach the natural end of their tenure simultaneously. Without deliberate staggering, an association's constitution can quietly produce exactly this outcome, a founding cohort of directors elected together, serving comparable terms, and departing together, taking a disproportionate share of the board's accumulated governance knowledge with them in a single election cycle.

This is sometimes called a cliff-edge turnover, and it is a different problem from the emergency succession scenario discussed previously. Nobody resigned suddenly. Nothing went wrong. The board simply followed its own election cycle to its logical conclusion, and arrived at a point where the majority of institutional memory left the room in the same year.

The Mechanics Of A Staggered Structure

The design pattern itself is straightforward and does not require complex drafting. A board divides its directors into groups, commonly thirds, with each group's terms expiring in a different year. Rather than an entire board facing election or re-election simultaneously, only one group rotates each cycle, meaning at any given point the board contains directors at different stages of tenure, some newly elected, some mid-term, some approaching the end of their service. New directors are inducted alongside experienced ones rather than alongside an equally inexperienced cohort, and institutional memory persists continuously rather than resetting every few years.

A board that turns over all at once has not avoided the succession problem. It has simply delayed it to a single, predictable, and entirely avoidable date.

The Real Trade-Off, Stated Honestly

Staggered terms are not costless, and a fair account of the practice should say so. They necessarily reduce how quickly a membership base can change board composition wholesale, which matters in the rare but real scenario where a membership wants rapid, comprehensive board renewal, following a governance failure, for instance. A fully staggered board cannot be entirely replaced in a single election, by design. This is why the structure suits most associations most of the time, continuity is usually the right default, but it is worth a board consciously deciding that trade-off is the right one for their organisation rather than adopting staggered terms, or rejecting them, without ever actually weighing it.

Building It Into Your Own Constitution

- Divide the board into groups whose terms expire in different years, calibrated to your actual board size and term length rather than copied wholesale from another organisation's structure.
- Confirm the transition itself is handled cleanly if your board does not currently stagger and wants to move to a staggered structure, since an uneven transitional cohort is often needed in the first cycle. Moving to staggered terms is a change to your constitution or rules, so write the transitional terms (who serves one, two or three years) into the special resolution that makes the change, and for an incorporated association confirm when the change takes effect under your state or territory Act.
- Cross-reference this directly against the succession planning approach discussed in the previous article, since staggering is one of the most effective structural tools for actually achieving the bench-strength continuity that article argued for.
- Revisit the grouping periodically as part of the constitutional review cycle discussed earlier in this series, since board size changes and casual vacancies can quietly erode a staggering structure's original balance over time if nobody is actively maintaining it. State in the constitution that a director appointed to fill a casual vacancy serves only until the end of the original term, or until the next general meeting if your Act or constitution requires it, so the rotation groups are preserved.

Staggered terms will not appear in any regulator's compliance checklist, because nothing requires them. That is exactly why they are easy to overlook, and exactly why the ones that do tend to notice the difference the first time a founding cohort would otherwise have walked out the door together.

This is one of the practical governance topics built into our Board Director course, alongside the papers, tools and frameworks that turn the principle into your board's actual practice. [Explore the course](#)

Annie Gibbins

Founder and CEO, Nexus Leadership

BOARDROOM ACTION WORKSHEET

Staggering Terms: Protecting Institutional Memory

Turn the resource into evidence, a decision and an accountable next step. Keep the completed record in your association's approved board records system.

1 What is the issue or decision?

State the governance question in one clear sentence.

2 What evidence do we already have?

Record the facts, source documents and stakeholder evidence available now.

3 What evidence is still needed?

Identify the legal, regulatory, financial, member or operational information still required.

4 What is the agreed next action?

Capture the owner, timeframe and how the matter will return to the board.

Action owner	Review date	Board decision or resolution

General education, not legal, financial, tax, clinical or governance advice. Confirm specifics at the relevant primary source or with your own qualified adviser. Nexus Leadership is operated by Lipstick Consulting Pty Ltd · ABN 15 619 120 482.

CONTINUE YOUR LEARNING

Turn governance principles into practical board action.

Self-paced courses, editable resources and practical support for association boards and CEOs at nexusleadership.com.au.