<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timestamp</th>
<th>Responses from co-chairs</th>
<th>Responses from committee members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/28/2021 14:33:04</td>
<td>First of all, thank you to the Structures and Processes Working Group for their bold, careful, and thoughtful work. They have done an exceptionally 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 evaluated. The process is not perfect and there are areas for improvement. The current EC really represents the membership in terms of its intersectional identities. How do we do 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 / 8. Membership / 5. Through 9: It’s stated that members will be “put forward by” or “determined by” respective Caucus/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-Caucus 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 Caucus/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 complicate 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.</td>
<td>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 changes. Or if we approved it in September of this year, we could have a shorter period for public comment, integrate changes, vote on them by November.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2021 12:49:32</td>
<td>1. This is a major (welcome) structural change to the organization. It would be great if there was more of 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 SIGs 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 Caucus. This would be 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 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!</td>
<td>Also yes to including an assessment component! TO - left 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2/2021 20:28:04</td>
<td>1. This is a major (welcome) structural change to the organization. It would be great if there was more of 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 SIGs 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 Caucus. This would be 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 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!</td>
<td>Also yes to including an assessment component! TO - left 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/2021 11:37:37</td>
<td>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 (personally/mystifying process of nomination and disconnect between membership &amp; EC) would be the best opportunity to break up the locked-off, gov structure. All 5 of those changes are 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 (AJ, Asian, Black, Latina, 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 on relationship between CCCC/NCCTE and how those factored into this proposal. 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? Yes, this became challenging; the SG on disability studies, we agreed was less a cultural identity/identity group and more a group focused on the subfield of disabilities studies (versus concerned with access/accessibility). Establishing an administrative structure—the CCCC would address this. Re: Arab/Muslim, 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 on the EC for a period of time that they have gotten established (I think 2 years but would have to check). Yes, the language is gonna trip many people up. Let’s move away from Identity Caucus. Let’s call them Permanent 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 permanent seats on the EC.</td>
<td>TO - I think the language is gonna trip many people up. Let’s move away from Identity Caucus. Let’s call them Permanent 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 permanent seats on the EC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/2021 12:42:24</td>
<td>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—at least they are not grouped with the other three editors.</td>
<td>Definitely an oversight—will need to be added!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/3/2021 12:46:52</td>
<td>In section 2A.1.c we say identities. It’s highlighted now. What do we mean by identities? Can we provide some context?</td>
<td>This was a tricky discussion point for us! I look forward to discussing it today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/4/2021 13:40:28</td>
<td>In the redline version file, Article 1, Section 3, there is the definition of inclusion that states that “the organization engages and supports all communities represented by the members”—I wonder if I should wonder if that language includes members who are part of racial, “left-right,” “Heterodox RhetoComp, ”while supremacist, etc. communities, and if so, what are the implications of that? Might we want more precise language here?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi all, Thanks for your hard work on this revisoning. 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/interests. It is a position that I think in the past 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 term left-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/Service Chair, 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.

Using existing structures, policies 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 equity 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.?

I would like to see addressed one of the comments on a previous feedback form. “Using existing structures, policies 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 a good point--the good news is that Caucasians have control not just of the current structures and processes, but of revising those to be more equitable. It would be inappropriate for the CCCCs 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 is functioning in alignment with the values now articulated in the constitutional revision, and to support changes to the group documents/procedures to improve them.

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”?

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.

Hi all, Thanks for your hard work on this revisoning. 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/interests. It is a position that I think in the past 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 term left-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/Service Chair, 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 open 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 (H4) 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 equity 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.?

I would like to see addressed one of the comments on a previous feedback form. “Using existing structures, policies 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 a good point--the good news is that Caucasians have control not just of the current structures and processes, but of revising those to be more equitable. It would be inappropriate for the CCCCs 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 is functioning in alignment with the values now articulated in the constitutional revision, and to support changes to the group documents/procedures to improve them.

Yes! I think this would absolutely be feasible. I could imagine a stable set of online resources, and an asynchronous or synchronous online workshop to talk through this type of work!

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 bylaws language versus constitution language (or may be something that, for example, is part of the DEI committee’s work in an ongoing way).

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 establish a voting status and explain how that would happen. You can find it in the rationale (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ye+e+7OAaMvJoQyoSmnDcIDGZcaJAPs3ApnVzbd4Oz/edit) on page 14 (at the bottom) and page 19 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 for this issue better.

We’ve created a process for new cultural identity caucuses to establish a voting status and explain how that would happen. You can find it in the rationale (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1ye+e+7OAaMvJoQyoSmnDcIDGZcaJAPs3ApnVzbd4Oz/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 for this issue better.
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