Timestamp	Please identify questions, comments, and suggestions here. The working group will review and use them to guide discussion at our August meeting.	Responses from co-chairs	Responses from committee members
7/28/2021 14:33:04	First of all, thank you to the Structures and Processes Working Group for their bold, careful, and thoughtful work. They have done an exceptional job identifying and articulating ingrained issues with our organization's long-standing governance structure and election processes. When reading the ballot before casting my vote, and when seeing my name on the ballot last year, I had the exact concern about transparency in terms of how the nominated candidates were vetted and pitted against each other to ensure representation. And more fundamentally, does the current EC "really" represent our membership in terms of its intersectional identities. How do we take a somewhat more progressive measure to fulfill the organization's mission? The proposed change is long overdue and welcome. While I think the details have been impressively well-thought-out, I do have a clarification question and a minor concern. First, the clarification question: p. 5 of the redline document / Section 1. / B. Membership / 5. through 9.: It's stated that members will be "put forward by" or "determined by" respective Caucuses/committees/Standing Groups. I wonder if it's necessary to spell out (in the Constitution itself or somewhere else) what these nomination processes entail. From my understanding through perusing the rationale document, for example, the 5 Cause members are Ex Officio members whose seats are guaranteed, while the 8 Standing Group members are elected along with other at-large candidates. What implications might these different procedures have for how these candidates are "determined" within their respective Caucuses/committees/Standing Groups? In general, I think procedures for electing ex officio voting members become more important as they take up significantly more seats on the EC according to the proposed change. Second, the concern: I understand and applaud the rationale behind the proposed structural change, which is to make the nomination and election processes more transparent and accessible, and to establish direct alignment between member-formed groups and the governing body. I wonder, though, if the change, given the increased complexity, might in turn further mystify the processes, create confusion, and potentially discourage member involvement, especially when they are introduced to new members of CCCC. I hope this thought doesn't come across as a reactionary viewpoint. I acknowledge the need for change and try to approach it from the perspective of a new or prospective CCCC member as perhaps the least experienced EC member.	generally standing groups (and Caucuses are standing groups) are required to have a set of bylaws (as I undersatnd it) and /or processes by which these take place; it shouldn't be set from a "top down" perpsective but rather from the member group itself. And thanks for the note about the complexity of the change! I think this is a suepr fair question adn something as an EC we would need to think through--my gut reaction based on the conversations I've already had about itw ith people is that those who have been engaged members see the need for a more transparent structure; I think while this is more complex, it is actually more transparent.	
8/2/2021 12:49:32			
8/2/2021 20:28:04	1. This is a major (welcome) structural change to the organization. It would be great if there was more than a vote from the membership. Is there no process for public comment?

2. Given that this puts a lot of power in the hands of the SIGs and SGs, it might be useful to have some form of accountability report from them. For example, some of these groups meet at times we cannot attend or compete against each other. Likewise, some are very clubby and communicate poorly. How can we make them more inclusive and accountable?

3. Do we have the right types of SGs for CCCC membership?

4. "One area that we want to talk through is the recommendation to create ex officio, voting seats for the five Cultural Identity Caucuses. This guarantees a specific level of representation, but some concerns we have heard are that this may feel like "enough,' or tokenizing. How can we ensure that the guaranteed seats are not viewed as sufficiently addressing the inclusion of historically marginalized perspectives?"

Yes, this was a concern from me, as well as some BIPOC colleagues who do not feel those caucuses serve them or overly represent the power of certain universities. This issue will not be "fixed" immediately and should ideally be revisited with input from membership.

5. Can we propose a self-study go along with these changes to assess how they have changed (or not) the organization in 2-3 years?

This revision is a major undertaking and the committee is to be applauded for its creativity and thoroughness in preparing these materials. Thank you!! | We can create a process for public comment (though we would have to figure out how to build that into our dissemination process, which is prescribed by the constitution). Once it is put forward for a vote, I don't think there's an opportunity for revision/change because it is published in the journal and voted on electronically. If we wanted to extend the process a year (to Feb 2022), we could do that and have wider input that would result in chagnes. Or if we approved it in september of this year, we could have a shorter period for pubilc comment, integrate changes, vote on them by November. | Also yes to including an assessment component! TO - Isn't that up to the Chair? AKA - might Stacey or Frankie need to do this rather than have it mandated by Holly or Julie (current chair) |
8/3/2021 11:37:37	These changes are long overdue, and I am in awe of the structural efforts for change. Many, many kudos for this vital work. The 2 issues identified in the rationale (personality/mysterious process of nomination and disconnect between membership & EC) appear to be addressed in the newly proposed gov structure. My only confusion at this point is about the division between the "cultural identity" caucuses and the standing groups. Some of the standing groups are also cultural identity markers like the 5 identified in the caucuses (e.g. disability and Arab/Muslim). My question is why do those specific 5 (AI, Asian, Black, Latinx, Queer) each get a spot while some other cultural identity markers (seemingly due to their group's standing as standing group rather than caucus) get to compete among those 8 spots designated for voting seats. I'm hoping this makes sense. Just an observation I thought I'd share. Finally, I'm wondering about discussions re relationship between EC/NCTE and how those factored into this proposal. Thanks!	Yes, this became chalelnging; the SG on disability studies, we agreed was less a cultural idetnity/idetnentity group and more a group focused on the subfield of disabilites studies (versus concerned with access/accessibility). Establishing an administrative structure--the CDICC--would address this. Re: Arab/Musli; I believe they have just been approved as a SG--the new documents specify that a cultural identity group will be eligible for a seat/to be added as a seat on the EC after a period of time that they have gotten established (I think 3 year but would have to check).	TO - I think the language is gonna trip many people up. Let's move away from Identity Caucus. Let's call them Permenant Caucus Seats (5) and General Caucus Seats (8). Rationale for 5 - These five have been selected by the EC for their long-standing, historic, and documented exclusion from governance structures and general participation by the organization. To account for this, they have been given peranent seats on the EC.
8/3/2021 12:42:24	In the new redline constitution, the forum editor has been added as a non voting member but they aren't in the new flow chart--or at least they are not grouped with the other three editors.	Definitely an oversight--will need to be added!	
8/3/2021 12:46:02	in section 2.A.1.c we say identities. It's highlighted now. What do we mean by identities? Can we provide some context?	This was a tricky discussion point for us! I look forward to discusing it today	
8/4/2021 13:40:28	In redline version file, Article 1, Section 3, there is the definition of Inclusion that states, "The organization engages and supports all communities represented by the members"—I suppose I wonder if that language includes members who are part of racist, "alt-right," "Heterodox Rhet/Comp," white supremacist, etc. communities, and if so, what are the implications of that? Might we want more precise language here?

It seems like the Jewish Caucus has been omitted from both visual depictions. Are they still in existence?

Thanks for your fantastic work, all! | See Rationale pg. 6 footnote re: Jewish Caucus/ good question on the inclusion definition--we may very well want to be more precise. This was forwarded to us from the CFC so we didn't want to change it without conversation with them.. | TO - We can add language similar to the following - "The organization engages and supports all communities represented by the members that commit to the mission of the organization." The goal here would be to link back to the mission which includes DEI. Member groups who do not suppor this mission will not be recognized formally. |
| | | | |

Timestamp	Please identify questions, comments, and suggestions here. The working group will review and use them to guide discussion at our August meeting.	Responses from co-chairs	Responses from committee members
8/6/2021 9:48:17	Hi all, Thanks for your hard work on this revisioning. My only comment is to think how there could be some LAC representation on the EC. The reason I say this is because folks in LAC leadership positions (see the LAC guidelines) tend to have or quickly learn about many of the "on-the-ground" challenges and insights into the Convention and member needs/desires. It is a position that I think in the past perhaps hasn't been fully understood but ever since the 2020 Convention many issues related to conference planning have brought to light. I'm wondering if the past LAC chair serves the following year on the EC -- perhaps for just one year? Or if we wanted another approach perhaps those who serve in LAC leadership (i.e. Local Arrangements Chair, Information, Hospitality, and Special Events/Services Chair, and Registration and Exhibits Chair) vote (or nominate) for someone to serve in this capacity -- each year. As you can see, I don't have a fleshed-out plan about how the LAC would get nominated onto the EC but my comment is more so to advocate the importance of having someone associated with the LAC to be on the EC. I think as you talk about membership and convention planning (particularly work related to the future and sustainability) having someone who recently did a lot of the planning would be an important perspective to include.	One issue with this to discuss would be the nature and process of how the LAC chair is selected; right now, the program chair identifies and selects that individual. There is no public/elected or even appointment process (such as we have with the editors); likewise the individual serves for a short period of time relative to the terms of service of other groups (EC members=3 years; editors=5 years; Officers=4 years) and so it would be challenging to identify a process that is fair and open while also useful to the planning process. If the group agrees this is a priority, we should discuss (HH)	TO - I wonder about this, too. This might be an issue of including the LAC in the bylaws so that the LAC has TWO rotating Chairs - a Chair and Assistant Chair with the expressed and direct articulation that the Chair guides the Assistant Chair into the position to maintain an orderly and historic through line? The LAC should definately have access to the Leadership Committee (the various Chairs) throughout the process. I think the spirit of this comment is to offer some orderly understanding of LAC and the lines of communications so that needs met.
10/11/2021 10:14:36	Using existing structures, polices and procedures around standing groups and caucuses to determine which identity caucuses are eligible for representation assumes that those structures, policies, and procedures are not themselves inequitable. This is highly problematic and further excludes those who are already excluded by these deeply embedded inequities.	This is a good point--the good news is that Caucuses have control not just of the current sturctures and processes, but of revising those to be more equitable. It would be inapprorpaite for the CCCC EC or larger governance group to mandate changes to these groups' organizational structures, but I think it would be possible to foster a similar type of assessment of how and whether the way things are operating at the Caucus level are functioning in alignment with the values now articulated int he constitutional revision, and to support changes to the group documents/processes to improve them.	
10/13/2021 9:36:17	I would like to see addressed one of the comments on a previous feedback form: "Using existing structures, polices and procedures around standing groups and caucuses to determine which identity caucuses are eligible for representation assumes that those structures, policies, and procedures are not themselves inequitable. This is highly problematic and further excludes those who are already excluded by these deeply embedded inequities." In addition to examining the equitability of existing structures, I would like for leadership to consider access to these structures. Might there be workshops/training to assist members in forming standing groups and caucuses, writing constitutions, etc.?	Yes! I think this would absolutely be feasible. I could imagine a stable set of online reosurces, and an asynchronous or synchronous online workshop to talk through this type of work!	
10/18/2021 9:32:57	Re: seats on the EC by caucuses. Generally a good idea, but the number of caucuses has changed in the 75 years since the organization was formed, and it'll probably change again. There was no Queer caucus 30 years ago, for example. Is it wise to enshrine in the constitution specific identities that will have seats on the EC, perhaps excluding new identities that the members will choose to recognize in decades hence? More procedurally, how do these seats come into being and how do they go away? What if a caucus just fizzles out due to lack of interest? Will there be a threshold where the EC says "you lose your seat due to inactivity"?	Thank you for this feedback! We actually do address this issue in the rationale document (which I acknowledge is quite long!). We've created a process for new cultural identity caucuses to be rotated in to the ex oficio voting status and explained how that would happen. You can find it in the rationale (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1we-n7OtAaAAwKYjzcOism8uCIDdBcaLlAPe2kfxfzpl/edit) on page 14 (at the bottom) and page 21 under "To Add Future Cultural Identity Caucuses to the Rotation." Hopefully this address this concern but we will take note and review to see if there is any language that should be added to account fo this issue better.	
10/18/2021 14:56:03	Feedback from the NTT/Alt-Ac WPA Standing Group: We commend the Executive committee for (1) their transparency and their involvement of us in this feedback process (including offering multiple feedback channels/opportunities), (2) revising the governance structure so that standing groups will have a voting presence, particularly that 2 out of 8 of the designees will be contingent faculty, and (3) ensuring that Cultural Identity Caucuses will be allocated a vote separate from non-Cultural Identity situated standing groups. We also have one piece of feedback for the executive committee's consideration, this is particularly focused on fair and equal representation on the CCCCs program. Because standing groups have an (almost) automatic guarantee of a panel session on the CCCCS program as well as a standing/business meeting time (two spaces on the print program), we think it's important for the CCCCs executive committee to work with standing groups to ensure that a diversity of voices and positionalities are represented on those sponsored panels. We recommend that the executive committee require that standing groups ensure fair and equal representation of panelists. One way to achieve this might be to require standing groups (non cultural identity groups) to submit post-conference micro-reports on if and how their sponsored panel included diverse voices (in terms of identity and status, including graduate student representation). After a certain amount of years (2 at most), failure to achieve diverse representation on a sponsored panel should jeopardize that standing group's allocated sponsored panel session. This has been a priority for our group for the past few years--it was not enough to circulate CFPs in diversely occupied spaces, and our recruiting efforts for diverse panel representation consistently failed. This will be the NTT/Alt AC WPA Standing Group's first year (in at least 3 or 4 years) with a graduate student panelist and with non-white panelists. We only achieved this because after working with all members to determine our panel theme, the executive leadership of the standing group met and researched graduate students and scholars of color in the field whose work aligned with our panel topic and then sent individual invites to individuals. Because getting on the CCCCs program is difficult when moving through the non-sponsored panel peer review process, we feel standing groups should be held accountable to ensuring that their non-peer-reviewed sessions honor the diversity of voices, perspectives, and identities of our field and profession.	This is useful feedback; our group will think about this asnd figure out how and where these standing group rights/responsibilities "live" and whether this point could be incorporated. For example, it could be in bylaws language versus constitution language (or may be something that, for example, is part of the DEI committee's work in an ongoing way).	
10/20/2021 13:10:40	Please ensure that in the constitution, terms such as "ex officio" and "at-large" are defined; these terms may not be familiar to all members and can obscure the role that such positions play. Will definitely be interested to understand how many members DEI committee, as well as the CDICC, will have and how these members will be chosen/elected. Suggestion that DEI committee have a clear set of goals/foci. Will it replace special committees such as the CFC and SJAC?	Yes to defining those terms. That is an excellent point. As to the DEI/CDICC and relationship to other committees; what this change does is to concretize the work of those groups at an organizational level (rather than as groups who operate as special committees which have a term of 3 years and are subject to continued renewal. This will ensure that DEI and access is central to the organization's work and not continue subject to being reconstituted, approved, etc. As to the process, it is laid out in the Constitution (and more detail will be provided in the Bylaws)	